DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 384 668 TM 023 977

AUTHOR	Wesley, Scott
TITLE	A Knowledge Base for Beginning Special Education Teachers. The Praxis Series: Professional Assessments for Beginning Teachers.
INSTITUTION	Educational Testing Service, Princeton, N.J.
REPORT NO	ETS-RR-93-62
PUB DATE	Oct 93
NOTE	101p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Administrators; *Beginning Teachers; College Faculty; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; Job Analysis; Job Skills; *Knowledge Base for Teaching; Licensing Examinations (Professions); Special Education; *Special Education Teachers; Teacher Certification; *Teacher Evaluation; *Test Construction
IDENTIFIERS	Experts; Praxis Series; *Subject Content Knowledge; Test Specifications

ABSTRACT

A job analysis was conducted to define the content domain in which newly licensed (certified) special education teachers must be knowledgeable to perform their jobs in a competent manner. The results of the job analysis will be used to develop test specifications for the Subject Assessment in Special Education of the Praxis Series: Professional Assessments for Beginning Teachers. A draft domain of knowledge statements was developed by Educational Testing Service staff with input from subject matter experts. The draft domain was reviewed by a panel of 11 subject matter experts and an advisory committee of 9 special education experts. An inventory with 189 knowledge statements in 11 categories was then subjected to verification through a national survey of 612 special education teachers, 306 college faculty, and 102 administrators. Participants rated the statements in terms of their importance for newly licensed special education teachers. Only 8 statements received lower than the 2.50 importance rating cutoff. The 181 statements that were verified as important can be used as the basis for the development of test specifications. Six appendixes provide supplemental information, including the survey and a lengthy table of importance ratings. Six tables illustrate study findings. (Contains 16 references.) (SLD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 384 668

THE PRAXIS SERIES
Professional Assessments for Beginning Teachers™

A Knowledge Base for Beginning Special Education Teachers

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
H. I. BRAUN
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Scott Wesley

October 1993

RR. 93-62

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Educational Testing Service

TM023977

Copyright © 1993 by Educational Testing Service. All rights reserved.

EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE, ETS and the ETS logo, and THE PRAXIS SERIES: PROFESSIONAL ASSESSMENTS FOR BEGINNING TEACHERS and its design logo are registered trademarks of Educational Testing Service.

A Knowledge Base for Beginning Special Education Teachers

Scott Wesley
Educational Testing Service
Division of Applied Measurement Research
Princeton, New Jersey

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank several people who provided assistance during the course of this study. Pam Smith, Ave Merritt, and Jane Dass of Educational Testing Service (ETS) School and Higher Education Programs did a wonderful job developing the initial draft of the special education content domain. They were also responsible for identifying and contacting external subject matter experts to review various draft versions of the content domain. I would also like to thank the members of the External Review Panel and the Advisory Committee for their significant contributions to the study. My gratitude also extends to Bob Boldt, Marylou Hennon, Richard Tannenbaum, and Mike Rosenfeld of ETS for their useful feedback on an earlier version of this report. Many thanks to Cindy Hammell, Kathy Fairall, and Diane Wattay of ETS for assisting in the development of this report. I would like to thank the representatives of the Council for Exceptional Children for providing the mailing list for the job analysis. Lastly, I want to acknowledge the several hundred special education teachers, college faculty, and administrators who took time away from their busy schedules to complete and return the survey.

Executive Summary

A job analysis was conducted to define the content domain in which newly licensed (certified) special education teachers must be knowledgeable to perform their jobs in a competent manner. The results of the job analysis will be used to develop test specifications for the Subject Assessment in Special Education of the Praxis Series: Professional Assessments for Beginning Teachers™.

A draft domain of knowledge statements was constructed by Educational Testing Service (ETS) Test Development staff with subject-matter expertise in special education and ETS Research staff with expertise in job analysis methodology. In the process of developing the draft domain, ETS subject-matter experts reviewed previous National Teacher Examination (NTE) special education test specifications and items, state licensure and certification requirements for special education teachers, and relevant professional literature. The resultant draft domain consisted of 10 major content areas and 170 knowledge statements. The ten content areas were: (a) Theories and Principles of Human Development, (b) Characteristics of Students with Exceptionalities, (c) Legal Issues and Compliance, (d) Social and Programmatic Issues Regarding Students With Exceptionalities, (e) Delivery of Services, (f) Design and Implementation of Instruction, (g) Classroom Management, (h) Assessment Principles and Practices, (i) Advocacy Role, and (j) Professional Development.

This draft domain was then reviewed by an External Review Panel of 11 special education subject-matter experts: two classroom teachers, seven college faculty, and two school district consultants. The panel reviewed the draft domain for (a) the appropriateness of its overall structure and (b) the appropriateness of the specific statements and their completeness and clarity. Revisions suggested by the panel were obtained via telephone interviews conducted by ETS Research staff. Wording changes were made to the draft domain and several additional statements were included. The revised domain consisted of 212 statements grouped in the same 10 major categories.

This revised draft domain was then reviewed by an Advisory/Test Development Committee of nine special education professionals. The committee comprised three classroom teachers, four college faculty, and two school administrators. Committee members were charged with modifying the revised draft domain so that it accurately reflected what they believed were the knowledge areas important for newly licensed (certified) special education teachers. This modification process occurred during a two-day meeting held in Princeton, New Jersey. The committee made numerous changes to the job analysis inventory, including changes to the title in the interest of making the inventory less ambiguous, changes to the directions, changes to the category headings, and changes to the knowledge statements themselves. The final form of the job analysis inventory comprises 189 knowledge statements grouped into 11 categories: (a) Theories and Principles of Human Development and Learning, (b) Conceptual Approaches to Disabilities (c) Characteristics of Students With Disabilities, (d) Legal Issues, Including Regulatory Compliance, (e) Basic Concepts in Special Education, (f) Placement and Program Issues, (g) Delivery of Services, (h) Assessment Principles and Practices, (i) Delivery of Instruction, (j) Classroom Management, and (k) Advocacy Role and Professional Growth.

This revised domain was then subjected to verification/refutation through a national survey of 612 teachers (approximately 12 per state and 12 from the District of Columbia), 306 college faculty (approximately 6 per state and 6 from the District of Columbia), and 102 school administrators (approximately 2 per state and 2 from the District of Columbia) for a total of 1,020 special education professionals. The mailing list was made up of names from the membership roster of the Council for Exceptional Children. Names from the roster were drawn at random in a way that satisfied the state participation requirements stated above.

The survey participants were asked to rate the statements in terms of their importance for newly licensed (certified) special education teachers to perform their jobs in a competent manner. The 5-point rating scale ranged from 0 (of no importance) to 4 (very important). The purpose of the survey administration was to identify a core of knowledge statements that relatively large numbers of special education professionals verified to be important for newly licensed (certified) special education teachers. The latter objective is accomplished through the analysis of the mean importance ratings provided by three groups of education professionals (i.e., teachers, administrators, and college faculty) and by appropriate subgroups of respondents (i.e., subgroups by gender, race/ethnicity, geographic region, teaching experience). Statements that are judged to be important by *all* respondent groups and subgroups define the core. The core becomes the primary data base for the development of test specifications. The derivation of test specifications from those statements verified to be important by the surveyed education professionals provides a substantial evidential basis for the content validity of The Praxis II Subject Assessment in Special Education.

Two types of data analysis were conducted to support the development of content valid test specifications for the Subject Assessment in Special Education: (a) Means were computed of the importance ratings for each knowledge statement by the three groups of education professionals and by the appropriate subgroups of respondents, and (b) correlations of the profiles of these mean importance ratings were computed across the three groups of education professionals and within the appropriate subgroups of respondents.

A cut point of a mean importance rating of 2.50 (the midpoint between moderately important [scale value 2] and important [scale value 3]) was established to identify the core of important statements. Statements that were judged by the groups of education professionals and all subgroups of respondents to be 2.50 or higher comprised the core and therefore were considered eligible for inclusion in the development of test specifications. (However, because the survey participants were not involved in the development of the knowledge domain, they may lack certain insights that the Advisory Committee members have due to their high level of involvement in the domain definition. As a consequence, if the committee believes that a knowledge statement rated below 2.50 should be included in the specifications and the committee can provide *compelling written rationales*, those knowledge statements may be reinstated for inclusion in the test specifications.)

The results of the mean analysis conducted for teachers, administrators, and college faculty showed that only eight statements were rated less than 2.50. This represents 4.2% of the content domain. In the subgroup analyses, seven statements (3.7%) were rated below 2.50. All seven of these statements were also identified in the prior analysis of employment category. *Thus, the two analyses together identified 8 of the 189 statements (4.2%) that did not meet the 2.50 criterion for inclusion*. Of the eight, four were in the Conceptual Approaches to Disabilities category and two were in the Basic Concepts in Special Education category.

The computation of correlation coefficients to assess agreement in terms of perceived relative importance of the knowledge statements revealed a very high level of agreement. The coefficients for comparisons among the teachers, administrators, and college faculty all exceeded .80. Coefficients generated during the demographic subgroup analyses all exceeded .90. These findings indicate that there is substantial agreement on the relative importance given to the statements by a diverse group of special education professionals.

The 181 knowledge statements that were verified to be important by the surveyed teachers, administrators, college faculty, and demographic subgroups should be used as the foundation for the development of test specifications for the Subject Assessment in Special Education. Test specifications that are linked to the results of a job analysis provide support for the content validity of the derived assessment measures and should be seen as part of an initial step in ensuring the fairness to subgroups of special education teacher candidates of the derived assessment measures. It is reasonable to assume that, because of testing and psychometric constraints (e.g., time limits, ability to measure some content reliably), not all of the verified content can be included in the assessment measures. One source of information that may be used to guide the Advisory Committee in their decision as to what verified content to include in the assessment measure is the mean importance rating. Although a rank ordering of the content by mean importance rating is not implied, it is recommended that initial consideration be given to content that is well above the cut point and represents the appropriate breadth of content coverage.

Evidence was also provided in this study of the comprehensiveness of the content domain within the 11 major content areas. This information has implications for the adequacy of the content domain. If the domain was adequately defined, then the categories should be judged to have been well covered by their accompanying statements. This supports the notion that the major knowledge categories were reasonably well covered and that the overall content domain was comprehensive.

Finally, data were collected regarding the emphasis that should be given in the test to each of the 11 categories. This information will be used by the Advisory Committee in their decisions about the appropriate weighting of the test.

Table of Contents

	Page
Acknowledgments	i
Executive Summary	ii
List of Tables	vii
Introduction	1
Purpose of the Study	1
Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing	1
Job Analysis	2
Objectives of the Job Analysis Study	2
Methods	2
Definition of the Knowledge Domain	3
Development of a Draft Knowledge Domain	3
Evaluation of Draft Domain by External Review Panel	3
Advisory Committee Meeting	4
Pilot Test of the Job Analysis Inventory	4
Large-Scale Survey	5
Survey Instrument	5
Survey Participants	5
Survey Administration	5
Data Analysis	6
Means	6
Correlations	6
Criterion for Interpretation of Mean Importance Ratings	7
Results	7
Survey Respondents	7
Response Rate	7
Demographic Characteristics	7

Page

Mean Importance Ratings 8

Special Education Professionals 8

Demographic Subgroups 8

Correlations of the Profiles of Mean Importance Ratings 10

Special Education Professionals 10

Demographic Subgroups 10

Mean Ratings of Content Coverage 10

Mean Percentage Weights for Test Content Emphasis: Recommendations for Test Content 12

Summary and Conclusions 12

References 14

Appendix A: Subject Matter Experts A1

Appendix B: Job Analysis Survey B1

Appendix C: Survey Materials C1

Appendix D: Demographic Distributions D1

Appendix E: Importance Ratings for Special Education Professionals E1

Appendix F: Importance Ratings for Demographic Subgroups F1

List of Tables

		Page
Table 1:	Mean Ratings Less Than 2.50 for Special Education Professionals	8
Table 2:	Mean Ratings Less Than 2.50 for Demographic Subgroups	9
Table 3:	Correlations of the Mean Importance Ratings Among Special Education Professionals	10
Table 4:	Correlations of the Mean Importance Ratings among Demographic Subgroups	11
Table 5:	Mean Ratings of Content Coverage	11
Table 6:	Mean Percentage Weights for Test Content Emphasis	12

Purpose of the Study

The subject assessments for The Praxis Series: Professional Assessments for Beginning Teachers™ are designed to assess a prospective teacher's content knowledge of a specific subject area and, in some cases, subject-specific pedagogical knowledge. The focus of such tests is based on the premise that beginning teachers should demonstrate knowledge of the subjects they intend to teach (Grossman, Wilson, & Shulman, 1989) and, perhaps, demonstrate knowledge of teaching principles, strategies, and resources specific to those subjects (Grossman, 1989; McDiarmid, Ball, & Anderson, 1989; Reynolds, 1992). The Praxis Series can be used by state agencies as one of several criteria for initial teacher licensure (certification). Included as part of the subject assessments is a licensure examination for special education teachers. To identify the content domain for this examination and to support the content validity (content relevance) of this examination, a job analysis was conducted to identify a knowledge base for newly licensed (beginning) special education teachers. This report will describe the job analysis study. In particular, it will provide the rationale for conducting the job analysis, present the methods used to define job-related knowledge, describe the types of statistical analysis conducted, report the results of these analyses, and specify the implications for developing test specifications.

Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing

The *Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing* (1985) is a comprehensive technical guide that provides criteria for the evaluation of tests, testing practices, and the effects of test use. It was developed jointly by the American Psychological Association (APA), the American Educational Research Association (AERA), and the National Council on Measurement in Education (NCME). The guidelines presented in the *Standards* have, by professional consensus, come to define the necessary components of quality testing. As a consequence, a testing program that adheres to the *Standards* is more likely to be judged to be valid and defensible than one that does not.

There are two categories of criteria within the *Standards*, primary and secondary. Those classified as primary "should be met by all tests . . . unless a sound professional reason is available to show why it is not necessary, or technically feasible, to do so in a particular case. Test developers and users . . . are expected to be able to explain why any primary standards have not been met" (AERA/APA/NCME, 1985, p. 2). One of the primary standards is that the content domain of a licensure or certification test should be defined in terms of the importance of the content for competent performance in an occupation. "Job analyses provide the primary basis for defining the content domain." (p. 64).

The use of job analysis to define the content domain is a critical component in establishing the content validity of licensure and certification examinations. Content validity is the primary validation strategy used for these examinations. It refers to the extent to which the content covered by an examination overlaps with the important components (tasks, knowledge, skills, or abilities) of a job (Arvey & Faley, 1988). Demonstration of content validity is accomplished the judgments of subject-matter experts. It is enhanced by the inclusion of large numbers of subject-matter experts who represent the diversity of the relevant areas of expertise (Ghiselli, Campbell, &

Zedeck, 1981). The lack of a well-designed job analysis is frequently cited by the courts as a major cause of test invalidity.

Job Analysis

Job analysis refers to procedures designed to obtain descriptive information about the tasks performed on a job and/or the knowledge, skills, and abilities thought necessary to adequately perform those tasks (Gael, 1983). The specific type of job information collected for a job analysis is determined by the purpose for which the information will be used. For purposes of developing licensure and certification examinations, a job analysis should identify the *important knowledge or abilities necessary to protect the public* (AERA, APA, & NCME, 1985). In addition, a well-designed job analysis should include the participation of various subject-matter experts (Mehrens, 1987); and the data collected should be representative of the diversity within the job. Diversity refers to regional or job context factors and to subject-matter-expert factors such as race/ethnicity, experience, and gender (Kuehn, Stallings, & Holland, 1990). The job analysis conducted for special education teachers was designed to follow the guidelines presented in the *Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing* and to adhere to accepted professional practice.

Objectives of the Job Analysis Study

The objectives of this study were (a) to construct a comprehensive domain of knowledge that is important for newly licensed (certified) special education teachers and then (b) to obtain, using survey methodology, the independent judgments of a national sample of special education professionals (teachers, administrators, and college faculty) to verify or refute the importance of the domain of knowledge. The verification/refutation component plays a critical part in ensuring that the domain (in whole or in part) is judged to be relevant to the job of a newly licensed (certified) special education teacher by a wide array of education professionals. The components of the domain that are verified should be used in the development of test specifications for The Praxis II Subject Assessment in Special Education.

Methods

The job analysis study described in this report involved a multi-method approach that included, as mentioned above, subject-matter experts and a national survey. First, groups of subject-matter experts defined a knowledge domain important for newly licensed/certified special education teachers. A description of this knowledge domain was then sent out to special education professionals through a large-scale national survey. The purpose of the survey administration was to obtain verification and/or refutation that the previous groups of subject-matter experts had defined a domain of knowledge that is important for newly licensed special education teachers. Through this process a core of important knowledge that is related to the job of the newly licensed special education teacher may be identified. The survey functions as a "check and balance" on the judgments of the subject-matter experts and reduces the likelihood that unimportant knowledge areas are included in the development of the test specifications. The use of a job analysis survey is also an efficient and cost-effective method of obtaining input from large numbers of subject-matter experts and makes it possible for ratings to be analyzed separately by appropriate subgroups.

The survey participants were special education teachers, administrators, and college faculty whose names and addresses were obtained from the membership roster of the Council for Exceptional Children (CEC), a large professional association for individuals in the special education field. The specific steps in the job analysis process are described below.

Definition of the Knowledge Domain

Development of a draft knowledge domain. The first step in the process of conducting the job analysis was to construct a preliminary knowledge domain. The domain was constructed by Educational Testing Service (ETS) Test Development staff who have subject-matter expertise in special education and ETS Research staff who have expertise in job analysis methodology. In the process of developing the draft, the ETS subject-matter experts reviewed state licensure and certification requirements for special education teachers, previous National Teacher Examination (NTE) special education test specifications, current test items, and relevant professional literature.

The resultant draft domain consisted of 10 major content areas and 170 knowledge statements. The 10 content areas were: (a) Theories and Principles of Human Development, (b) Characteristics of Students with Disabilities (c) Legal Issues and Compliance, (d) Social and Programmatic Issues Regarding Students With Disabilities, (e) Delivery of Services, (f) Design and Implementation of Instruction, (g) Classroom Management, (h) Assessment Principles and Practices, (i) Advocacy Role, and (j) Professional Development.

Evaluation of draft domain by External Review Panel. Consistent with a content validity framework, the job analysis study was designed to obtain input from many subject-matter experts at several critical points in the domain definition process. To this end, an External Review Panel of 11 special education professionals was formed to review the draft domain. The panel consisted of two classroom teachers, seven college faculty, and two special education school district consultants. Individuals were considered for membership through a process of peer recommendation. All of the review panelists have experience either teaching special education or supervising teachers of special education. Generally, they are prominent and active in professional associations and/or teacher licensure. In addition to their subject-matter expertise, the panel was formed so as to have representation by gender, race/ethnicity, and geographic location. Members of the panel are listed in Appendix A.

The panelists were instructed to review the draft and to make modifications they felt were necessary to cover adequately the important aspects of teaching special education. They were further instructed that these modifications could include restructuring the content domain in terms of its major categories, adding important knowledge statements, deleting unimportant statements, elaborating statements with relevant examples, and revising statements into language that is clear and appropriate for individuals in special education. The panelists were interviewed via telephone by ETS Research staff to obtain their suggestions for modification.

Information from the interviews was compiled, discussed with ETS Test Development staff, and, subsequently, used to revise the draft. Wording changes were made to the draft, and some additional statements were included. The revised draft consisted of 212 statements grouped into the same 10 major categories.

Advisory Committee meeting. The next step in the job analysis process was a meeting held in January 1993 in Princeton, New Jersey, with an Advisory Committee of nine subject-matter specialists. The committee was charged with developing a final version of the job analysis inventory and with developing the specifications for the new test. The committee will also be responsible for developing and revising test items and assembling the final form of the test. Like the External Review Panelists, members of the advisory committee have documented knowledge of and experience in special education. The committee comprises three classroom teachers, four college faculty members, and two school administrators and has representation by gender, ethnicity, and geographic location. Members of the committee are also listed in Appendix A.

The meeting was led jointly by ETS Test Development and Research staff. Prior to the meeting, committee members were mailed a copy of the draft domain to review. They were informed about the purpose of the meeting and asked to come prepared to discuss their review. Because they will use the results obtained from the survey administration of the content domain, it is critical that committee members have a clear understanding of each statement. The group interaction during the meeting fostered discussions that generated suggestions not made during the individual interviews with the External Review Panelists.

The committee made numerous changes to the job analysis inventory, including changes to the knowledge statements themselves, changes to the category headings and directions, and changes to the inventory title in the interest of making it more appropriate and less ambiguous. The final form of the job analysis inventory comprises 189 knowledge statements grouped into 11 categories: (a) Theories and Principles of Human Development and Learning, (b) Conceptual Approaches to Disabilities (c) Characteristics of Students With Disabilities, (d) Legal Issues, Including Regulatory Compliance, (e) Basic Concepts in Special Education, (f) Placement and Program Issues, (g) Delivery of Services, (h) Assessment Principles and Practices, (i) Delivery of Instruction, (j) Classroom Management, and (k) Advocacy Role and Professional Growth.

During the meeting, the Advisory Committee also reviewed and approved the proposed rating scale for the inventory. The rating scale required respondents to make judgments regarding importance for the newly licensed teacher. The importance scale, which is shown below, is in compliance with professional standards (cf. AERA, APA, & NCME, 1985).

> How important is the knowledge and understanding of this topic to the competent performance of a newly licensed (certified) special education teacher?
>
> (0) Of no importance
> (1) Of little importance
> (2) Moderately important
> (3) Important
> (4) Very important

The committee also reviewed and approved items concerning demographic and background information (e.g., gender, teaching experience, geographic location). Such items were included so that we could describe the composition of the survey respondent group and conduct analyses of the survey responses by various subgroups of respondents (e.g., males and females).

Pilot test of the job analysis inventory. After the meeting, a revised job analysis inventory was given to the committee members for final approval. Once approval was obtained, the

inventory was pilot tested on a group of four classroom teachers and two college faculty. The pilot participants were asked to review the survey for clarity of wording, ease of use, and comprehensiveness of content coverage. The pilot test indicated that no one had difficulty completing the inventory and that no additional changes were necessary.

Large-Scale Survey

Survey instrument. The finalized survey consisted of three parts. Part I included the 11 major knowledge categories and the 189 specific knowledge statements. Survey respondents were asked to rate the statements using the importance scale shown above.

For each major knowledge category, there was also a content coverage question in Part I. Survey participants were asked to indicate how well each major category was covered by its knowledge statements. Respondents made their judgments using a 5-point rating scale (1=Poorly, 2=Somewhat, 3=Adequately, 4=Well, 5=Very well). The participants also had an opportunity to identify and write in knowledge statements that they believed should be added to the domain.

In Part II of the survey, participants were asked to indicate the weight (emphasis) that each of the major knowledge categories should receive on the assessment. This was accomplished by distributing 100 total points across the major categories. These point distributions were converted into percentages, representing the percentage of items that the survey respondents believed should be devoted to each area.

In Part III, participants were asked for demographic and background information. As previously noted, these items are used to describe the respondents and to perform subgroup analyses. A copy of the final version of the survey is provided in Appendix B.

Survey participants. The primary sample for this study consisted of 612 teachers (approximately 12 per state and the 12 from the District of Columbia), 306 college faculty (approximately 6 per state and 6 from the District of Columbia), and 102 school administrators (approximately 2 per state and 2 from the District of Columbia) for a total of 1,020 education professionals (approximately 20 per state and the District of Columbia). The mailing list was made up of names from the CEC membership roster so that appropriate people could be reached. Names from the roster were drawn at random in such a way as to satisfy the state participation requirements noted above.

Survey administration. The surveys were administered to the sample in April 1993. Each survey was accompanied by a letter of invitation to participate and a postage-paid envelope for return of the completed survey. A reminder postcard was mailed approximately one week after the survey mailing. The cover letter and follow-up postcard are provided in Appendix C.

The purpose of the survey administration was to identify a core of knowledge statements that relatively large numbers of special education professionals judged to be relevant (verified as important) to newly licensed (certified) special education teachers. The latter objective was accomplished through an analysis of the mean importance ratings provided by the three groups of education professionals and by the appropriate subgroups of respondents. Knowledge statements that were judged to be important by each of the education professionals groups and each of the demographic subgroups define the core. The core will become the primary data base for the

development of test specifications for the Subject Assessment in Special Education. The derivation of test specifications from those knowledge statements verified as important by the surveyed professional will provide a substantial evidential basis for the content validity of the assessment.

Data Analysis

Two types of data analysis were conducted to support the development of content valid test specifications for the Subject Assessment in Special Education: (a) Means were computed of the importance ratings for each knowledge statement by the three groups of special education professionals and by the appropriate subgroups of respondents, and (b) correlations of the profiles of these mean importance ratings were computed across the three groups of professionals and the appropriate subgroups of respondents.

Means. The mean analysis is used to determine the level (absolute value) of importance attributed to each knowledge statement. Means were computed for teachers, administrators, and college faculty and for appropriate subgroups of respondents (gender, race/ethnicity, geographic region, special education teaching experience). An analysis of importance ratings by geographic region is consistent with the recent legal emphasis on addressing regional job variability when job analyses are conducted for content domain specification purposes (Kuehn et al., 1990). We used the regional categorizations established by the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification (NASDTEC) in our analysis. Gender and race/ethnicity subgroups were included because they represent protected "classes" under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. We used a dichotomous breakdown of teaching experience at the five-year point so that the judgments of less experienced teachers and more experienced teachers could each be represented. Only classroom teachers, not administrators or college faculty, were included in the analysis of teaching experience.

A respondent category was required to have at least 30 respondents to be included in the mean analysis (e.g., $\geq$ 30 college faculty, $\geq$ 30 females). This number of respondents is a commonly-used standard in mean analysis studies in that it provides some assurance that the sample mean is a reasonable estimate of the corresponding population mean (Walpole, 1974).

In addition, mean ratings were computed for the responses to the content coverage questions and the Recommendation for Test Content section of the job analysis survey. These analyses were computed for the three groups of special education professionals and for the total sample.

Correlations. The correlational analysis is used to determine the extent of agreement among the three groups of special education professionals and among the demographic subgroups of respondents about the relative importance of the knowledge statements. Relative importance refers to the similarity of the pattern of mean ratings generated by the different respondent groups. For example, the profile of 189 mean ratings for teachers is correlated with the profile of 189 mean ratings for administrators. If these two profiles are similar (the shapes of the profiles are complementary), the value of the correlation coefficient will be close to 1.00.

Criterion for Interpretation of Mean Importance Ratings

Since the purpose of a job analysis is to ensure that only the most important knowledge statements are included in the development of test specifications, a criterion (cut point) for inclusion is needed. For the importance rating scale used in the present job analysis, the value of this criterion is 2.50 (midpoint between moderately important and important). It is believed that this criterion is consistent with the intent of content validity, which is to measure only important knowledge in the assessment device. Therefore, knowledge statements that receive a mean importance rating of 2.50 or more may be considered eligible for inclusion in the development of test specifications; knowledge statements that receive a mean rating of less than 2.50 may not be considered for inclusion. This criterion has been used in similar studies (Rosenfeld & Tannenbaum, 1991; Wesley, 1993). Because survey participants were not involved in the development of the content domain, however, they may lack certain insights that the Advisory Committee members have because of their high level of involvement in the definition of the domain. Consequently, if the committee believes that a knowledge statement rated below 2.50 should be included in the specifications and the committee can provide *compelling written rationales*, those knowledge statements may be reinstated for inclusion in the test specifications.

Results

Survey Respondents

Response rate. Of the 1,020 inventories mailed, 16 were returned incomplete for a variety of reasons (e.g., wrong address, individual was retired and declined to participate). Of the remaining 1,004, 547 (54.5%) were completed and returned.

Demographic characteristics. Results of the analyses of the responses to the demographic questions in the inventory are summarized in Appendix D. The survey respondents tended to be over 35 years old (81.9%), female (75.7%), White (90.6%), have at least a master's degree (80.7%), and have more than five years of experience working in special education (83.3%). In general, it appears that the demographic composition of the survey respondents is representative of the teaching profession at large (cf. Feistritzer, 1986). In terms of geographic location, the survey respondents were reasonably well distributed across the four regions: Northeast -- 21.1%, Central -- 26.3%, South -- 25.0%, and Far West -- 26.3%.

The respondents who taught tended to do so in one of three settings: public school for students with disabilities (24.4%), nonspecialized school (public or private) (32.5%), or college (21.7%). Respondents were reasonably well distributed on the background question concerning grades currently teaching: Preschool/kindergarten -- 17.6%, Grades 1-4 -- 28.7%, Grades 5-8 -- 33.1%, Grades 9-12 -- 19.3%, and College -- 12.3%. Oft-cited student populations were: students with learning disabilities (50.7%), students with behavioral disorders/emotional disturbances (44.3%), and students with mild/moderate mental retardation (37.3%).[1]

---

[1] Respondents could indicate multiple responses to this question and the question concerning grades currently teaching. Hence, the summed percentages exceed 100%.

Mean Importance Ratings

Special education professionals. Means and standard deviations were computed for teachers, administrators, and college faculty survey respondents. Because of their length, these data are provided in Appendix E.

Those knowledge statements rated less than 2.50 by any of the three groups are provided in Table 1. An empty cell in Table 1 indicates that the mean rating is 2.50 or higher. Of the 189 individual knowledge statements, only 8 (4.2%) were rated below 2.50 by one or more of the three groups. This indicates that the iterative process undertaken to develop the draft was effective in identifying knowledge areas that are important for newly licensed special education teachers. Of the eight statements with low ratings, four were in the Conceptual Approaches to Disabilities category, two were in the Basic Concepts in Special Education category, one was in Legal Issues, Including Regulatory Compliance, and one was in Delivery of Instruction. Hence, all statements in 7 of the 11 categories were approved by the special education professionals.

Table 1
Mean Ratings Less Than 2.50 for Special Education Professionals

		Teachers (N = 295)	Administrators (N = 41)	College Faculty (N = 110)
B.	CONCEPTUAL APPROACHES TO DISABILITIES			
	9. Medical		2.38	2.36
	10. Physiological		2.35	2.43
	11. Perceptual-motor			2.28
	12. Psychodynamic			2.30
D.	LEGAL ISSUES, INCLUDING REGULATORY COMPLIANCE			
	70. Social and legal considerations prior to PL 94-142		2.37	
E.	BASIC CONCEPTS IN SPECIAL EDUCATION			
	79. Historical movements/trends in special education	2.40	2.41	
	85. Prevalence and incidence of disabilities	2.34	2.15	2.38
I.	DELIVERY OF INSTRUCTION			
	Instructional Format and Components			
	161. Lecture	2.16	2.02	2.17

Demographic subgroups. Means were computed for demographic subgroups based on gender, race/ethnicity, geographic region, and teaching experience. These data are presented in table format in Appendix F.

Those knowledge statements rated less than 2.50 by any of the 12 demographic subgroups are provided in Table 2. Of the 189 individual knowledge statements, 7 (3.7%) were rated below 2.50 by one or more of the subgroups. All seven statements also appear in Table 1, as they were rated below the cut point by one or more of the employment subgroups.

Table 2
Mean Ratings Less Than 2.50 for Demographic Subgroups

		Gender		Race/Ethnicity		Geographic Region				Experience	
		F	M	POC	W	NE	C	S	FW	≤5	>5
B.	CONCEPTUAL APPROACHES TO DISABILITIES										
	9. Medical								2.46		
	11. Perceptual-motor		2.47								
	12. Psychodynamic		2.44								
D.	LEGAL ISSUES, INCLUDING REGULATORY COMPLIANCE										
	70. Social and legal considerations prior to PL 94-142								2.48		
E.	BASIC CONCEPTS IN SPECIAL EDUCATION										
	79. Historical movements/trends in special education	2.47			2.48		2.37		2.46		2.35
	85. Prevalence and incidence of disabilities	2.31	2.32		2.27	2.21	2.27	2.42	2.34	2.36	2.32
I.	DELIVERY OF INSTRUCTION										
	Instructional Format and Components										
	161. Lecture	2.16	2.06		2.11	2.35	2.03	2.02	2.20	2.15	2.17

Note: F = Female (N = 412); M = Male (N = 127); POC = People of Color (N = 42); W = White (N = 493); NE = Northeast (N = 115); C = Central (N = 143); S = Southern (N = 136); FW = Far West (N = 143); ≤5 = 5 years teaching experience or less--teachers only (N = 88); >5 = More than 5 years teaching experience--teachers only (N = 204). Mean ratings that are less than 2.50 are shaded.

Correlations of the Profiles of Mean Importance Ratings

Special education professionals. Correlations were computed among arrays of means for the teachers, administrators, and college faculty. The obtained correlations are provided in Table 3. The reasonably high correlations in Table 3 indicate a substantial level of agreement across the three employment groups on the relative importance of the statements.

Demographic subgroups. Correlations were computed among arrays of means for the selected subgroups of respondents (e.g., males and females). This is done as a way of evaluating agreement among subgroups. The resulting correlations are provided in Table 4. Note that all values are above .90. This indicates a high level of agreement among subgroups and is consistent with general findings in the job analysis literature (e.g., Rosenfeld & Tannenbaum, 1991; Schmitt & Cohen, 1989).

Table 3
Correlations of Mean Importance Ratings Among Special Education Professionals

	1	2	3
1. Teachers (N = 295)	1.00		
2. Administrators (N = 41)	.92	1.00	
3. College Faculty (N = 110)	.81	.85	1.00

Mean Ratings of Content Coverage

The survey participants were asked to indicate, using a five-point rating scale, how well the statements within each of the major knowledge categories covered the important aspects of the category. Responses to these questions provide an indication of the adequacy (comprehensiveness) of the content domain. The scale values were 1=Poorly, 2=Somewhat, 3=Adequately, 4=Well, 5=Very well. The mean ratings for the teachers and college faculty in the primary and supplemental samples and for all respondents in the total sample are presented in Table 5. The mean ratings for the total sample exceed 4.00 on all categories. Further, the category means for the three employment subgroups exceed 4.00 on all but two instances (Conceptual Approaches to Disabilities for Administrators and Basic Concepts in Special Education also for Administrators). This supports the notion that the major knowledge categories were reasonably well covered and that the overall content domain was comprehensive.

Table 4
Correlations of Mean Importance Ratings Among Demographic Subgroups

	1	2	3	4
Gender				
1. Female (N=412)	1.00			
2. Male (N=127)	.94	1.00		
Racial/Ethnic Background				
1. People of Color (N=42)	1.00			
2. White (N=493)	.91	1.00		
Geographic Region				
1. Northeast (N=115)	1.00			
2. Central (N=143)	.96	1.00		
3. South (N=136)	.94	.96	1.00	
4. Far West (N=143)	.95	.97	.95	1.00
Teaching Experience (teachers only)				
1. 1 - 5 years (N=88)	1.00			
2. Greater than 5 years (N=204)	.95	1.00		

Table 5
Mean Ratings of Content Coverage

Knowledge Category	Teachers (N=295)	Admin. (N=41)	College Faculty (N=110)	Total Sample (N=547)
Theories and Principles of Human Development and Learning	4.05	4.12	4.02	4.05
Conceptual Approaches to Disabilities	4.05	3.97	4.04	4.04
Characteristics of Students with Disabilities	4.33	4.26	4.21	4.30
Legal Issues, Including Regulatory Compliance	4.18	4.12	4.18	4.16
Basic Concepts in Special Education	4.07	3.78	4.01	4.02
Placement and Program Issues	4.28	4.33	4.32	4.27
Delivery of Services	4.33	4.25	4.20	4.27
Assessment Principles and Practices	4.30	4.38	4.30	4.30
Delivery of Instruction	4.43	4.41	4.29	4.40
Classroom Management	4.26	4.31	4.23	4.27
Advocacy Role and Professional Growth	4.18	4.15	4.25	4.19

Mean Percentage Weights for Test Content Emphasis: Recommendations for Test Content

In Part III of the survey, Recommendations for Test Content, participants are asked to indicate how many test questions (out of 100) should be included from each of the knowledge categories. This information may be used by the Advisory Committee to assist them in making decisions about how much emphasis the knowledge categories should receive in the test specifications. The mean weights for the teachers, administrators, and college faculty respondents and for the respondents in the total sample are presented in Table 6. In general, the categories received very similar weights from the survey respondents. *Delivery of Instruction* and *Classroom Management*, however, had slightly higher mean weights than the other categories.

Table 6
Mean Percentage Weights for Test Content Emphasis

Knowledge Category	Teachers (N = 295)	Admin. (N = 41)	College Faculty (N = 110)	Total Sample (N = 547)
Theories and Principles of Human Development and Learning	6.48	6.73	7.26	6.93
Conceptual Approaches to Disabilities	6.44	6.70	6.64	6.60
Characteristics of Students with Disabilities	10.60	9.68	9.49	10.28
Legal Issues, Including Regulatory Compliance	8.09	7.59	7.79	7.95
Basic Concepts in Special Education	7.93	9.30	8.03	8.06
Placement and Program Issues	8.92	8.86	8.14	8.71
Delivery of Services	9.89	10.43	8.76	9.60
Assessment Principles and Practices	9.76	9.08	10.75	9.89
Delivery of Instruction	13.44	13.43	15.09	13.83
Classroom Management	12.47	12.49	12.37	12.32
Advocacy Role and Professional Growth	6.19	5.38	6.23	6.04

Summary and Conclusions

A job analysis was conducted to define a content domain in which newly licensed (certified) special education teachers must be knowledgeable to perform their jobs in a competent manner. A draft domain of important knowledge statements was constructed by ETS Test Development staff with expertise in special education and ETS Research staff with expertise in job analysis. This draft domain was reviewed by an External Review Panel of subject-matter experts and revised as they judged necessary. The revised draft was then reviewed, modified, and approved during a meeting of the Special Education Advisory Committee. The revised knowledge domain was then subjected to verification/refutation through the use of a national survey of special education teachers, administrators, and college faculty. The survey participants were asked to rate specific knowledge statements of the domain using a five-point importance scale. A cut point of 2.50 (midpoint between moderately important and important) was chosen to designate knowledge statements as eligible (≥ 2.50) or ineligible (< 2.50) for inclusion in the development of test specifications.

The results of the mean analysis conducted for teachers, administrators, and college faculty yielded only 8 of 189 knowledge statements with ratings less than 2.50. This represents 4.2% of the proposed content domain. When the same analysis was conducted for demographic subgroups, very similar results were obtained (i.e., seven statements yielded mean ratings below 2.50, and the seven were previously identified by the prior analysis). Thus, the data analyses yielded only eight statements (4.2%) that did not meet the 2.50 criterion for inclusion. This supports the premise that the iterative process undertaken to develop the draft and the use of subject-matter experts during the process were effective in identifying knowledge areas that are important for newly licensed special education teachers.

The 181 knowledge statements that were verified to be important by those surveyed should be used as the foundation for the development of test specifications for the special education examination. Test specifications that are linked to the results of a job analysis provide support for the content validity of the derived assessment measures and may be considered part of an initial step in ensuring the fairness to subgroups of special education teacher candidates of the derived assessment measures. It is reasonable to assume that because of testing and psychometric constraints (e.g., time limits, ability to measure some content reliably) not all of the verified content will be included in the new assessment measure. One source of information that may be used to guide the Advisory Committee in their decision as to what verified content to include is the mean importance rating. While a strict rank ordering of the content by mean rating is not implied, it is recommended that initial consideration be given to content that is well above the criterion and represents the appropriate breadth of content coverage as stipulated in the test specifications.

Correlation coefficients were used to assess relative agreement in terms of perceived importance of the knowledge statements. All coefficients exceeded .80. These findings indicate that there is substantial agreement in the importance ratings given to these statements across a wide array of special education professionals.

Evidence was also provided in this study of the comprehensiveness of the content domain within each of the 11 major knowledge categories. The results indicated that the survey respondents thought the categories were reasonably well covered by their statements.

Finally, data were collected in the Recommendations for Test Content section of the survey regarding the emphasis that should be given in the test to each of the 11 categories. This information will be used by the Advisory Committee in their decisions about the appropriate weighting of the test.

In summary, this study utilized a multi-method approach to identify a content domain that is related to the job of the newly licensed special education teacher. The job analysis process allowed for input from many practicing professionals in special education. The results of the study will be used to develop specifications for the special education test that will be included as part of the subject assessments of The Praxis Series: Professional Assessments for Beginning Teachers™.

References

American Educational Research Association, American Psychological Association, National Council on Measurement in Education. (1985). *Standards for educational and psychological testing*. Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.

Arvey, R. D., & Faley, R. H. (1988). *Fairness in selecting employees*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Civil Rights Act of 1964, Title VII, 42 U. S. C. § 2000e.

Feistritzer, C. E. (1986). *Profile of teachers in the U.S.* Washington, DC: National Center for Education Information.

Gael, S. (1983). *Job analysis: A guide to assessing work activities*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Ghiselli, E. E., Campbell, J. P., & Zedeck, S. (1981). *Measurement theory for the behavioral sciences*. San Francisco, CA: W. H. Freeman.

Grossman, P. L. (1989). A study in contrast: Sources of pedagogical content knowledge for secondary Mathematics. *Journal of Teacher Education, 40*(5), 24-31.

Grossman, P. L., Wilson, S. M., & Shulman, L. S. (1989). Teachers of substance: Knowledge for teaching. In M. C. Reynolds (Ed.), *Knowledge base for the beginning teacher* (pp. 193-205). Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Kuehn, P. A., Stallings, W. M., & Holland, C. L. (1990). Court-defined job analysis requirements for validation of teacher certification tests. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice, 9*, 21-24.

McDiarmid, G. W., Ball, D. L., & Anderson, C. W. (1989). Why staying one chapter ahead doesn't really work: Subject-specific pedagogy. In M. C. Reynolds (Ed.), *Knowledge base for the beginning teacher* (pp. 193-205). Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Mehrens, W. A. (1987). Validity issues in teacher licensure tests. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 1*, 195-229.

Reynolds, A. (1992). What is competent beginning teaching? A review of the literature. *Review of Educational Research, 62*, 1-35.

Rosenfeld, M., & Tannenbaum, R. J. (1991). *Identification of a core of important enabling skills for the NTE Successor Stage I examination* (Research Rep. No. 91-37). Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

Schmitt, N., & Cohen, S. C. (1989). Internal analyses of task ratings by job incumbents. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 74*, 96-104.

Walpole, R. E. (1974). *Introduction to statistics* (2nd ed.). New York: Macmillan.

Wesley, S. (1993). *Job analysis of the knowledge important for newly licensed teachers of English* (Research Rep. No. 93-24). Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

Appendix A

Subject Matter Experts

External Review Panel
Advisory Committee

External Review Panel

Classroom Teachers

Agnes August
New Orleans Public Schools
New Orleans, LA

Marsha Kirchner
SW Cook County Coop for Special Education
Chicago, IL

College Faculty

Helen Bessant-Byrd
Norfolk State University
Norfolk, VA

Bridgie Alexis Ford
University of Akron
Akron, OH

Betty A. Hallenbeck
University of Virginia
Charlottesville, VA

David Martinez
Portland State University
Portland, OR

C. Michael Nelson
University of Kentucky
Lexington, KY

David Podell
College of Staten Island
City University of New York
Staten Island, NY

M. Lewis Putnam
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
Milwaukee, WI

Consultants

Andrea Taylor Claud
Virginia Department of Education
Norfolk Public Schools
Norfolk, VA

Christine Nemeth
Auburn School District
Issaquah, WA

Advisory Committee

Classroom Teachers

Annemieke Golly
Santa Clara Elementary School
Eugene, OR

Susan Wells
Highland Elementary School
Wheaton, MD

Dorothyann Lapresi
New York City Board of Education
Queens, NY

College Faculty

Reuben Altman
University of Missouri
Columbia, MO

Cathy D. Kea
North Carolina A & T State University
Greensboro, NC

Barbara D. Bateman
University of Oregon
Eugene, OR

James A. McLoughlin
University of Louisville
Louisville, KY

School Administrators

Pamela Gillet
Northwest Suburban Special Education Organization
Mt. Prospect, IL

Cheryl W. Pinkney
Sunflower County School District
Indianola, MS

Appendix B

Job Analysis Survey

An Inventory of the Knowledge Base for Beginning Special Education Teachers

Educational Testing Service
Division of Applied Measurement Research
Princeton, New Jersey
March 1993

Copyright © 1993 by Educational Testing Service. All rights reserved.

Educational Testing Service, ETS, and the ETS logo are registered trademarks of Educational Testing Service. The Praxis Series: Professional Assessments for Beginning Teachers and its design logo are trademarks of Educational Testing Service.

INTRODUCTION

Educational Testing Service (ETS) is in the process of developing a new series of tests, The Praxis Series: Professional Assessments for Beginning Teachers™. These assessments include a set of Subject Assessments that measure subject-matter knowledge and, where appropriate, knowledge about teaching. The inventory that follows is part of our development effort and is designed to gather information concerning the knowledge requirements for special education teachers. It was developed by classroom teachers, school administrators, and college faculty working with ETS staff.

The inventory is primarily focused on the body of knowledge that is common across all areas of specialization within special education. However, you will note that special emphasis has been placed on the high incidence areas of emotional disturbances/behavior disorders, learning disabilities, and mental retardation.

The educators who collaborated on the construction of this inventory recognize that beginning special education teachers may be required to teach a variety of concepts and skills to multiaged students from diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds and with a wide range of abilities. For these reasons, the collaborators believe that these teachers should have a broad understanding of students with special needs. The inventory asks you to react to a list of topics and to rate each for its importance to the core of knowledge that newly licensed (certified) special education teachers must have, regardless of their type of certification. **Try not to relate each topic to the requirements of your own job but rather to what you believe new teachers should know in order to teach in a competent manner.**

The information you provide will ultimately be used to guide the development of a new special education test. It is expected that this test will differ from other special education licensing examinations in both content and design. In addition to the development of a new test, this study represents an important contribution to our understanding of the knowledge requirements for special education teachers. We expect the results of the study to be widely disseminated and to have ramifications for teacher education and professional development. Thank you for your assistance.

PART I - KNOWLEDGE AREAS

This section focuses on some of the knowledge areas that newly licensed (certified) special education teachers use in their work. In Part I you will find the following broad categories:

A. THEORIES AND PRINCIPLES OF HUMAN DEVELOPMENT AND LEARNING
B. CONCEPTUAL APPROACHES TO DISABILITIES
C. CHARACTERISTICS OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES
D. LEGAL ISSUES, INCLUDING REGULATORY COMPLIANCE
E. BASIC CONCEPTS IN SPECIAL EDUCATION
F. PLACEMENT AND PROGRAM ISSUES
G. DELIVERY OF SERVICES
H. ASSESSMENT PRINCIPLES AND PRACTICES
I. DELIVERY OF INSTRUCTION
J. CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT
K. ADVOCACY ROLE AND PROFESSIONAL GROWTH

Within each broad category, there are a number of specific topics that we would like you to consider. Please rate the importance of each topic using the question and 0 to 4 rating scale below.

IMPORTANCE: How important is the knowledge and understanding of this topic to the competent performance of a newly licensed (certified) special education teacher?

0 Of no importance
1 Of little importance
2 Moderately important
3 Important
4 Very important

To familiarize yourself with the categories and topics, you may wish to glance through Part I before making your rating judgments.

IMPORTANCE: How important is the knowledge and understanding of this topic to the competent performance of a newly licensed (certified) special education teacher?

0 Of no importance
1 Of little importance
2 Moderately important
3 Important
4 Very important

Circle your response using the scale adjacent to each topic.

A. THEORIES AND PRINCIPLES OF HUMAN DEVELOPMENT AND LEARNING	IMPORTANCE
1. Research and theories related to human development (e.g., Piaget, Gesell)	0 1 2 3 4
2. Theories of learning	0 1 2 3 4
3. Social and emotional development	0 1 2 3 4
4. Language development	0 1 2 3 4
5. Cognitive development	0 1 2 3 4
6. Physical development (including motor and sensory)	0 1 2 3 4
7. **Overall evaluation of the importance of Theories and Principles of Human Development and Learning**	0 1 2 3 4

8. How well do the topics in section A cover the important aspects of Theories and Principles of Human Development and Learning?

1	2	3	4	5
Very Poorly	Poorly	Adequately	Well	Very Well

What important aspects, if any, are not covered?

_____

_____

B. CONCEPTUAL APPROACHES TO DISABILITIES	IMPORTANCE
9. Medical	0 1 2 3 4
10. Physiological	0 1 2 3 4
11. Perceptual-motor	0 1 2 3 4
12. Psychodynamic	0 1 2 3 4
13. Behavioral	0 1 2 3 4
14. Sociological	0 1 2 3 4
15. Cognitive	0 1 2 3 4
16. Ecological	0 1 2 3 4
17. Eclectic	0 1 2 3 4

IMPORTANCE: How important is the knowledge and understanding of this topic to the competent performance of a newly licensed (certified) special education teacher?

0 Of no importance
1 Of little importance
2 Moderately important
3 Important
4 Very important

Circle your response using the scale adjacent to each topic.

B. CONCEPTUAL APPROACHES TO DISABILITIES (cont.)

IMPORTANCE

18. **Overall evaluation of the importance of Conceptual Approaches to Disabilities** 0 1 2 3 4

19. How well do the topics in section B cover the important aspects of Conceptual Approaches to Disabilities?

1	2	3	4	5
Very Poorly	Poorly	Adequately	Well	Very Well

What important aspects, if any, are not covered?

_____

_____

C. CHARACTERISTICS OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES

IMPORTANCE

General Characteristics of Students with Disabilities

Please rate statements #20-28 on their importance across all categories of disability.

20. Physical and health 0 1 2 3 4
21. Motor 0 1 2 3 4
22. Speech and language 0 1 2 3 4
23. Motivational 0 1 2 3 4
24. Cognitive 0 1 2 3 4
25. Learning 0 1 2 3 4
26. Academic 0 1 2 3 4
27. Social 0 1 2 3 4
28. Emotional 0 1 2 3 4

IMPORTANCE: How <u>important</u> is the knowledge and understanding of this topic to the competent performance of a <u>newly licensed (certified)</u> special education teacher?

0 Of no importance
1 Of little importance
2 Moderately important
3 Important
4 Very important

Circle your response using the scale adjacent to each topic.

C. <u>CHARACTERISTICS OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES (cont.)</u>	<u>IMPORTANCE</u>
<u>Characteristics of Students with Emotional Disturbances or Behavior Disorders</u>	
29. Adaptive behavior	0 1 2 3 4
30. Affective behavior	0 1 2 3 4
31. Social/emotional development (e.g., intrapersonal: self-esteem, self-concept)	0 1 2 3 4
32. Social/interpersonal skills (e.g., with teachers, parents, peers)	0 1 2 3 4
33. Relationship between emotional disturbance/behavior disorder and distractibility, hyperactivity, and impulsivity	0 1 2 3 4
34. Social maladjustment (e.g., delinquency, conduct disorders)	0 1 2 3 4
35. Aggression and/or acting out	0 1 2 3 4
36. Passivity and/or withdrawal	0 1 2 3 4
37. Anxiety and/or depression	0 1 2 3 4
38. Self-injurious behavior	0 1 2 3 4
39. Neuroses (e.g., phobias, psychosomatic disorders)	0 1 2 3 4
40. Psychoses	0 1 2 3 4
41. Eating disorders	0 1 2 3 4
42. Substance abuse	0 1 2 3 4
<u>Characteristics of Students with Learning Disabilities</u>	
43. Rate of learning	0 1 2 3 4
44. Memory deficits	0 1 2 3 4
45. Deficits in automaticity	0 1 2 3 4
46. Social/emotional development (e.g., interpersonal, self-esteem, self-concept)	0 1 2 3 4
47. Intra-individual differences	0 1 2 3 4
48. Discrepancy between potential and achievement	0 1 2 3 4
49. Attention deficits (i.e, distractibility, hyperactivity, and impulsivity)	0 1 2 3 4
50. Academic deficits (e.g., in listening skills, written expression, reading, mathematics)	0 1 2 3 4

IMPORTANCE: How important is the knowledge and understanding of this topic to the competent performance of a newly licensed (certified) special education teacher?

0 Of no importance
1 Of little importance
2 Moderately important
3 Important
4 Very important

Circle your response using the scale adjacent to each topic.

C. CHARACTERISTICS OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES (cont.)

IMPORTANCE

Characteristics of Students with Learning Disabilities (cont.)

51. Deficits in study skills and organizational skills 0 1 2 3 4
52. Deficits in metacognitive strategies and learning strategies 0 1 2 3 4

Characteristics of Students with Mental Retardation

53. Adaptive behavior 0 1 2 3 4
54. Rate of learning 0 1 2 3 4
55. Memory deficits 0 1 2 3 4
56. Generalization deficits 0 1 2 3 4
57. Skill maintenance deficits 0 1 2 3 4
58. Incidental learning deficits 0 1 2 3 4
59. Deficits in abstract thinking 0 1 2 3 4
60. Resistance to change 0 1 2 3 4
61. Affective behavior 0 1 2 3 4
62. Physical and motor development 0 1 2 3 4
63. Language development 0 1 2 3 4
64. Augmentative communication needs 0 1 2 3 4
65. Social/emotional development (e.g., interpersonal, self-esteem, self-concept) 0 1 2 3 4
66. Family and personal living skills (e.g., sexuality, self-care) 0 1 2 3 4
67. Dependency or outer-directedness 0 1 2 3 4
68. **Overall evaluation of the importance of Characteristics of Students with Disabilities** 0 1 2 3 4

IMPORTANCE: How important is the knowledge and understanding of this topic to the competent performance of a newly licensed (certified) special education teacher?

0 Of no importance
1 Of little importance
2 Moderately important
3 Important
4 Very important

Circle your response using the scale adjacent to each topic.

C. CHARACTERISTICS OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES (cont.)

69. How well do the topics in section C cover the important aspects of Characteristics of Students with Disabilities?

1	2	3	4	5
Very Poorly	Poorly	Adequately	Well	Very Well

What important aspects, if any, are not covered?

_____

_____

D. LEGAL ISSUES, INCLUDING REGULATORY COMPLIANCE	IMPORTANCE
70. Social and legal considerations prior to the Education for All Handicapped Children Act (PL 94-142)	0 1 2 3 4
71. Major provisions of the Education for All Handicapped Children Act (PL 94-142)	0 1 2 3 4
72. Major provisions of the Education of the Handicapped Amendments of 1986 (PL 99-457)	0 1 2 3 4
73. Major provisions of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (PL 101-476)	0 1 2 3 4
74. Major provisions of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 Section 504 (PL 93-104)	0 1 2 3 4
75. Major provisions of the Americans with Disabilities Act (PL 101-336)	0 1 2 3 4
76. Educational implications of landmark court cases (e.g., Rowley--program appropriateness, Tatro--related services, Honig--discipline, Burlington--reimbursement to parents)	0 1 2 3 4
77. **Overall evaluation of the importance of Legal Issues, including Regulatory Compliance**	0 1 2 3 4

IMPORTANCE: How important is the knowledge and understanding of this topic to the competent performance of a newly licensed (certified) special education teacher?

0 Of no importance
1 Of little importance
2 Moderately important
3 Important
4 Very important

Circle your response using the scale adjacent to each topic.

D. LEGAL ISSUES, INCLUDING REGULATORY COMPLIANCE (cont.)

78. How well do the topics in section D cover the important aspects of Legal Issues, Including Regulatory Compliance?

1	2	3	4	5
Very Poorly	Poorly	Adequately	Well	Very Well

What important aspects, if any, are not covered?

_____

_____

E. BASIC CONCEPTS IN SPECIAL EDUCATION	IMPORTANCE
79. Historical movements/trends in special education (e.g., deinstitutionalization, normalization, application of technology, advocacy)	0 1 2 3 4
80. Public attitudes toward individuals with disabilities	0 1 2 3 4
81. Causation and prevention of disability (e.g., environmental factors, cultural factors, genetic factors, neurological factors)	0 1 2 3 4
82. Definitions and descriptions of all major categories of disability	0 1 2 3 4
83. Definitions and descriptions of specific disabilities, such as ADD/ADHD, Fragile-X syndrome, cerebral palsy, Prader-Willi syndrome	0 1 2 3 4
84. Classification of students with disabilities (e.g., labeling, race and gender issues, definition issues, limitations of standardized tests)	0 1 2 3 4
85. Prevalence and incidence of disabilities (e.g., variability across states and regions; variability across age, gender, and socioeconomic groups)	0 1 2 3 4
86. Frequency/duration/intensity of behaviors	0 1 2 3 4
87. Degrees of severity	0 1 2 3 4
88. **Overall evaluation of the importance of Basic Concepts in Special Education**	0 1 2 3 4

IMPORTANCE: How <u>important</u> is the knowledge and understanding of this topic to the competent performance of a <u>newly licensed (certified)</u> special education teacher?

0 Of no importance
1 Of little importance
2 Moderately important
3 Important
4 Very important

Circle your response using the scale adjacent to each topic.

E. BASIC CONCEPTS IN SPECIAL EDUCATION (cont.)

89. How well do the topics in section E cover the important aspects of Basic Concepts in Special Education?

1	2	3	4	5
Very Poorly	Poorly	Adequately	Well	Very Well

What important aspects, if any, are not covered?

_____

_____

F. PLACEMENT AND PROGRAM ISSUES	IMPORTANCE
90. Early intervention	0 1 2 3 4
91. Family participation and support systems	0 1 2 3 4
92. Continuum of alternative placement/services	0 1 2 3 4
93. Mainstreaming, integration, inclusion	0 1 2 3 4
94. Least-restrictive environment	0 1 2 3 4
95. Noncategorical, categorical, and cross-categorical programs	0 1 2 3 4
96. Related services for students with disabilities	0 1 2 3 4
97. Regular Education Initiative (REI)	0 1 2 3 4
98. Cultural and community influences	0 1 2 3 4
99. Community-based training	0 1 2 3 4
100. Transition of students into and within special education placements	0 1 2 3 4
101. Post-school transition of students with disabilities (e.g., vocational training, post-secondary education, community living, family life)	0 1 2 3 4
102. Access to assistive technology, services, and devices	0 1 2 3 4
103. **Overall evaluation of the importance of Placement and Program Issues**	0 1 2 3 4

IMPORTANCE: How important is the knowledge and understanding of this topic to the competent performance of a newly licensed (certified) special education teacher?

0 Of no importance
1 Of little importance
2 Moderately important
3 Important
4 Very important

Circle your response using the scale adjacent to each topic.

F. PLACEMENT AND PROGRAM ISSUES (cont.)

104. How well do the topics in section F cover the important aspects of Placement and Program Issues?

1	2	3	4	5
Very Poorly	Poorly	Adequately	Well	Very Well

What important aspects, if any, are not covered?

_____

_____

G. DELIVERY OF SERVICES

		IMPORTANCE
105.	Teacher as a consultant/collaborator with other teachers and school staff (e.g., initial consultation, teacher assistance teams, cooperative partnerships)	0 1 2 3 4
106.	Teacher as a multidisciplinary team member (e.g., during referral, evaluation, IEP development, placement, and annual reviews)	0 1 2 3 4
107.	Teacher as a collaborator with parents	0 1 2 3 4
108.	Teacher as a collaborator with community groups and outside agencies	0 1 2 3 4
109.	Teacher's role in transition planning	0 1 2 3 4
110.	Teacher's role in the selection of appropriate, least-restrictive environment (i.e., matching characteristics and needs of students to placement options)	0 1 2 3 4
111.	Types of specific programs (e.g., early intervention, career/vocational education)	0 1 2 3 4
112.	Teacher's role in providing health-related services (e.g., catheterization, seizure management, medication monitoring)	0 1 2 3 4
113.	Teacher's role in working with related service providers (e.g., school social worker, speech and language therapist, physical therapist)	0 1 2 3 4
114.	**Overall evaluation of the importance of Delivery of Services**	0 1 2 3 4

IMPORTANCE: How important is the knowledge and understanding of this topic to the competent performance of a newly licensed (certified) special education teacher?

0 Of no importance
1 Of little importance
2 Moderately important
3 Important
4 Very important

Circle your response using the scale adjacent to each topic.

G. DELIVERY OF SERVICES (cont.)

115. How well do the topics in section G cover the important aspects of Delivery of Services?

1	2	3	4	5
Very Poorly	Poorly	Adequately	Well	Very Well

What important aspects, if any, are not covered?

_____

_____

H. ASSESSMENT PRINCIPLES AND PRACTICES

		IMPORTANCE
116.	Basic measurement concepts (i.e., reliability, validity)	0 1 2 3 4
117.	Interpretation of standardized test scores (e.g., percentiles, standard scores)	0 1 2 3 4
118.	Nondiscriminatory evaluation issues and procedures (e.g., bias in testing, culture-free instruments, multidisciplinary approaches, multifaceted evaluation)	0 1 2 3 4
119.	Norm-referenced tests (group and individual)	0 1 2 3 4
120.	Accommodations and modifications of evaluation procedures	0 1 2 3 4
121.	Criterion-referenced and curriculum-based assessments	0 1 2 3 4
122.	Informal assessments (e.g., teacher-made tests, teacher observations, interviews, checklists, ecological surveys, error analysis, interest inventories)	0 1 2 3 4
123.	Portfolio assessment	0 1 2 3 4
124.	Selection of appropriate evaluation techniques for various purposes (e.g., screening, program evaluation, student performance assessment)	0 1 2 3 4
125.	Use of evaluation data to monitor effectiveness of student's instructional program (e.g., continuous measurement and monitoring of progress)	0 1 2 3 4
126.	Interpretation of specialized evaluation results (e.g., psychological, educational, speech and language, social history, medical history) for IEP development and instructional planning	0 1 2 3 4
127.	Interpretation and reporting of assessment findings to parents and to educators outside of special education	0 1 2 3 4

IMPORTANCE: How important is the knowledge and understanding of this topic to the competent performance of a newly licensed (certified) special education teacher?

0 Of no importance
1 Of little importance
2 Moderately important
3 Important
4 Very important

Circle your response using the scale adjacent to each topic.

H. ASSESSMENT PRINCIPLES AND PRACTICES (cont.)

IMPORTANCE

128. Preparation of written reports of assessment findings 0 1 2 3 4

129. **Overall evaluation of the importance of Assessment Principles and Practice** 0 1 2 3 4

130. How well do the topics in section H cover the important aspects of Assessment Principles and Practice?

1	2	3	4	5
Very Poorly	Poorly	Adequately	Well	Very Well

What important aspects, if any, are not covered?

_____

_____

I. DELIVERY OF INSTRUCTION

IMPORTANCE

Participation with Others in the IEP Process

131. Determination of current levels of performance 0 1 2 3 4

132. Determination of instructional needs 0 1 2 3 4

133. Determination of necessary special education related services 0 1 2 3 4

134. Determination of necessary modifications to standard educational practices 0 1 2 3 4

135. Preparation of IEP instructional goals and objectives 0 1 2 3 4

136. Ensuring the legal correctness of the IEP 0 1 2 3 4

Instructional Development and Implementation

137. Data collection and data-based decision-making strategies for the classroom 0 1 2 3 4

138. Chronological age appropriateness of instructional activities and materials 0 1 2 3 4

139. Developmental age appropriateness of instructional activities and materials 0 1 2 3 4

140. Appropriate sequencing of instruction 0 1 2 3 4

IMPORTANCE: How important is the knowledge and understanding of this topic to the competent performance of a newly licensed (certified) special education teacher?

0 Of no importance
1 Of little importance
2 Moderately important
3 Important
4 Very important

Circle your response using the scale adjacent to each topic.

I. DELIVERY OF INSTRUCTION (cont.)	IMPORTANCE
Instructional Development and Implementation (cont.)	
141. Methods for enhancing motivation (e.g., encouragement, reinforcement, feedback)	0 1 2 3 4
142. Alternative methods for evaluation and grading	0 1 2 3 4
143. Identification, use, and evaluation of curricular materials, resources, and equipment	0 1 2 3 4
144. Modification and adaptation of curricular materials, resources, and equipment	0 1 2 3 4
145. Working with classroom personnel including volunteers, teacher aides, consultants, and external resources	0 1 2 3 4
146. Use of cross-age and peer-group tutoring	0 1 2 3 4
147. Use of technology for instruction	0 1 2 3 4
148. Addressing cultural, linguistic, and gender differences in instruction	0 1 2 3 4
149. Awareness of the influence of students' abilities and aptitudes on their understanding of given concepts and on their achievement	0 1 2 3 4
Teaching Strategies and Methods	
150. Direct instruction	0 1 2 3 4
151. Cooperative learning	0 1 2 3 4
152. Task analysis techniques	0 1 2 3 4
153. Diagnostic-prescriptive method	0 1 2 3 4
154. Applied behavior analysis	0 1 2 3 4
155. Learning styles	0 1 2 3 4
Instructional Format and Components	
156. Individualized instruction	0 1 2 3 4
157. Small group instruction	0 1 2 3 4
158. Large group instruction	0 1 2 3 4
159. Modeling	0 1 2 3 4

IMPORTANCE: How important is the knowledge and understanding of this topic to the competent performance of a newly licensed (certified) special education teacher?

0 Of no importance
1 Of little importance
2 Moderately important
3 Important
4 Very important

Circle your response using the scale adjacent to each topic.

I. DELIVERY OF INSTRUCTION (cont.)

IMPORTANCE

Instructional Format and Components (cont.)

160. Demonstration 0 1 2 3 4
161. Lecture 0 1 2 3 4
162. Drill and practice 0 1 2 3 4
163. Arrangement of timing and pacing 0 1 2 3 4
164. Questioning techniques (e.g., level of complexity, wait time) 0 1 2 3 4
165. Corrective feedback 0 1 2 3 4
166. Reinforcement of correct responses 0 1 2 3 4

Areas of Instruction

167. Teaching academics 0 1 2 3 4
168. Teaching study and organizational skills 0 1 2 3 4
169. Teaching learning strategies (e.g., SQ3R, memory strategies, PIE, metacognition, time management, visualization, prediction) 0 1 2 3 4
170. Teaching social skills 0 1 2 3 4
171. Teaching self-care and daily living skills 0 1 2 3 4
172. Teaching vocational skills 0 1 2 3 4
173. **Overall evaluation of the importance of Delivery of Instruction** 0 1 2 3 4

174. How well do the topics in section I cover the important aspects of Delivery of Instruction?

1	2	3	4	5
Very Poorly	Poorly	Adequately	Well	Very Well

What important aspects, if any, are not covered?

_____

_____

IMPORTANCE: How important is the knowledge and understanding of this topic to the competent performance of a newly licensed (certified) special education teacher?

0 Of no importance
1 Of little importance
2 Moderately important
3 Important
4 Very important

Circle your response using the scale adjacent to each topic.

J. CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT	IMPORTANCE
Classroom Organization	
175. Physical environment (e.g., lighting, seating, barrier-free access)	0 1 2 3 4
176. Social environment (e.g., interaction patterns, strategies for fostering peer acceptance, attitudinal barriers)	0 1 2 3 4
177. Grouping students	0 1 2 3 4
178. Structure of the classroom learning environment (e.g., expectations, rules)	0 1 2 3 4
179. Transitions between lessons and activities	0 1 2 3 4
Managing Student Behavior	
180. Behavior analysis (i.e., identification and definition of antecedents, target behaviors, and consequent events)	0 1 2 3 4
181. Data gathering procedures (e.g., anecdotal data, frequency methods, interval methods)	0 1 2 3 4
182. Intrusiveness of behavioral interventions	0 1 2 3 4
183. Clinical and counseling approaches to change behavior (e.g., assertive discipline, modeling, peer teaching)	0 1 2 3 4
184. Behavioral approaches to change behavior (e.g., contracts, operant conditioning, token systems, time out)	0 1 2 3 4
185. Self-management techniques (e.g., cognitive behavior modification, self-talk, self-recording, self-assessment, self-monitoring)	0 1 2 3 4
186. Affective approaches (e.g., values clarification, class meetings, role playing, stress management)	0 1 2 3 4
187. **Overall evaluation of the importance of Classroom Management**	0 1 2 3 4

IMPORTANCE: How important is the knowledge and understanding of this topic to the competent performance of a newly licensed (certified) special education teacher?

0 Of no importance
1 Of little importance
2 Moderately important
3 Important
4 Very important

Circle your response using the scale adjacent to each topic.

J. CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT (cont.)

188. How well do the topics in section J cover the important aspects of Classroom Management?

1	2	3	4	5
Very Poorly	Poorly	Adequately	Well	Very Well

What important aspects, if any, are not covered?

_____

_____

K. ADVOCACY ROLE AND PROFESSIONAL GROWTH

		IMPORTANCE
189.	Teacher's role as advocate for students and families	0 1 2 3 4
190.	Teacher's role as advocate for educational change	0 1 2 3 4
191.	Teacher's role as promoter of advocacy (e.g., helping parents become advocates for their children, developing student self-advocacy)	0 1 2 3 4
192.	Responsibilities in cases of suspected abuse or neglect	0 1 2 3 4
193.	Use of professional literature (e.g., research journals, education-related publications, references and resources)	0 1 2 3 4
194.	Implications of formal published research for classroom practice	0 1 2 3 4
195.	Use of informal classroom research to improve instruction	0 1 2 3 4
196.	Professional organizations and associations for teachers in special education	0 1 2 3 4
197.	Awareness of the influence that teacher attitudes and expectations have on student achievement and behavior	0 1 2 3 4
198.	Reflection on one's own teaching	0 1 2 3 4
199.	**Overall evaluation of the importance of Advocacy Role and Professional Growth**	0 1 2 3 4

IMPORTANCE: How <u>important</u> is the knowledge and understanding of this topic to the competent performance of a <u>newly licensed (certified)</u> special education teacher?

0 Of no importance
1 Of little importance
2 Moderately important
3 Important
4 Very important

Circle your response using the scale adjacent to each topic.

K. ADVOCACY ROLE AND PROFESSIONAL GROWTH (cont.)

200. How well do the topics in section F cover the important aspects of Advocacy Role and Professional Growth?

1	2	3	4	5
Very Poorly	Poorly	Adequately	Well	Very Well

What important aspects, if any, are not covered?

_____

_____

PART II - RECOMMENDATIONS FOR TEST CONTENT

Listed below are the eleven topic areas that may be covered on a new licensure examination for special education teachers. If the new examination contains 100 questions, how many questions should be included from each topic area? If you feel an area should not be represented in the examination, write 0 in the space provided. Make sure your responses sum to 100.

TOPIC AREAS	NUMBER OF QUESTIONS (out of 100)
1. THEORIES AND PRINCIPLES OF HUMAN DEVELOPMENT AND LEARNING	_____
2. CONCEPTUAL APPROACHES TO DISABILITIES	_____
3. CHARACTERISTICS OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES	_____
4. LEGAL ISSUES, INCLUDING REGULATORY COMPLIANCE	_____
5. BASIC CONCEPTS IN SPECIAL EDUCATION	_____
6. PLACEMENT AND PROGRAM ISSUES	_____
7. DELIVERY OF SERVICES	_____
8. ASSESSMENT PRINCIPLES AND PRACTICES	_____
9. DELIVERY OF INSTRUCTION	_____
10. CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT	_____
11. ADVOCACY ROLE AND PROFESSIONAL GROWTH	_____
Total	**100**

PART III - BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The information that you provide in this section is completely confidential and will be used for research purposes only. Please answer each question by circling the number that most closely describes you or your professional activities. Unless otherwise indicated, please circle only one response for each question.

1. Where do you work?

1. Alabama
2. Alaska
3. Arizona
4. Arkansas
5. California
6. Colorado
7. Connecticut
8. Delaware
9. District of Columbia
10. Florida
11. Georgia
12. Hawaii
13. Idaho
14. Illinois
15. Indiana
16. Iowa
17. Kansas
18. Kentucky
19. Louisiana
20. Maine
21. Maryland
22. Massachusetts
23. Michigan
24. Minnesota
25. Mississippi
26. Missouri
27. Montana
28. Nebraska
29. Nevada
30. New Hampshire
31. New Jersey
32. New Mexico
33. New York
34. North Carolina
35. North Dakota
36. Ohio
37. Oklahoma
38. Oregon
39. Pennsylvania
40. Puerto Rico
41. Rhode Island
42. South Carolina
43. South Dakota
44. Tennessee
45. Texas
46. Utah
47. Vermont
48. Virginia
49. Washington
50. West Virginia
51. Wisconsin
52. Wyoming

2. What is your age?

1. Under 25
2. 25-34
3. 35-44
4. 45-54
5. 55-64
6. Over 65

3. What is your sex?

1. Female
2. Male

4. How do you describe yourself?

1. American Indian, Native Americans, Inuit, or Aleut
2. Black or African American
3. Mexican American or Chicano
4. Oriental or Asian American
5. Puerto Rican
6. Other Hispanic or Latin American
7. White
8. Other

5. Which of the following best describes your highest educational attainment?

1. Less than a Bachelors
2. Bachelors
3. Bachelors + additional credits
4. Masters
5. Masters + additional credits
6. Doctorate

6. Which of the following best describes your current employment status?

1. Temporary substitute (assigned on a daily basis)
2. Permanent substitute (assigned on a longer term basis)
3. Teacher
4. Principal or Assistant Principal
5. School Administrator
6. Curriculum Supervisor
7. State Administrator
8. College Faculty
9. Other (please specify) _____

7. How many years have you worked in the field of special education in any capacity?

1. Less than 1 year
2. 1 - 2 years
3. 3 - 5 years
4. 6 - 10 years
5. 11 - 15 years
6. 16 - 20 years
7. 21 or more years
8. Never worked in the field of special education

8. How many years have you taught in the field of special education?

1. Less than 1 year
2. 1 - 2 years
3. 3 - 5 years
4. 6 - 10 years
5. 11 - 15 years
6. 16 - 20 years
7. 21 or more years
8. Never taught in the field of special education

9. What grade level(s) are you currently teaching? (Circle all that apply)

1. Preschool/Kindergarten
2. Grades 1-4
3. Grades 5-8
4. Grades 9-12
5. College
6. Do not teach--Administrator or Other
7. Do not teach--Retired
8. Other (please specify) _____

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

10. Which of the following best describes your current teaching assignment? (Circle all that apply)

    1. Students with mild/moderate mental retardation
    2. Students with severe/profound mental retardation
    3. Students with learning disabilities
    4. Students with sensory impairments
    5. Students with physical impairments
    6. Students with behavior disorders/emotional disturbances
    7. College students
    8. Do not teach
    9. Other (please specify)_____

11. In which of the following settings do you teach? (If you teach in more than one setting, please circle the one setting in which you spend most of your time.)

    1. Public school for students with disabilities
    2. Private school for students with disabilities
    3. Nonspecialized school (public or private)
    4. Residential treatment facility or institution
    5. Correctional facility
    6. College
    7. Do not teach
    8. Other (please specify)_____

12. To which of the following organizations do you belong? (Circle all that apply)

    1. American Federation of Teachers
    2. American Psychological Association
    3. Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development
    4. Council for Exceptional Children
       Division _____
    5. Council of Administrators of Special Education
    6. National Association of State Directors of Special Education
    7. National Education Association
    8. Other (please specify)_____

Thank you for completing this questionnaire.
Please return it within two weeks using the enclosed envelope.

Appendix C

Survey Materials

Cover Letter
Follow-Up Postcard

EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE PRINCETON, N.J. 08541

DIVISION OF ALLIED
MEASUREMENT RESEARCH

Cover Letter

April 1993

Dear Colleague:

I am writing to ask your cooperation in a project that should be of importance to teachers, college faculty, administrators, and other professionals in special education. Educational Testing Service (ETS) is in the process of developing a new generation of assessments for the purpose of licensing teachers. One type of assessment will be created to measure the prospective teacher's subject-matter or specialty-area knowledge and will likely be administered upon completion of the undergraduate teacher education program. One such assessment is a new special education test. I am asking for your help as we develop this examination.

As part of the developmental process, ETS has worked closely with an advisory committee of classroom teachers, college faculty, and school administrators to identify potentially important knowledge areas in special education instruction. The enclosed inventory has been constructed as a way to obtain your judgments on the importance of these areas for the newly licensed (certified) special education teacher.

The value of a study like this one is directly related to the number of individuals who return completed questionnaires. A preliminary study has indicated that this questionnaire will take approximately 30 minutes to complete. I urge you to take the time to complete your questionnaire. Your responses and those of other professionals will guide the development of the new examination.

You will notice that the inventory asks for some background information about you; this is solely for purposes of describing respondents. Your answers will be treated in strict confidence.

A postage-paid envelope is enclosed for the return of your completed questionnaire. Please return it within two weeks. If you have any questions about the study, please feel free to call me at (609) 734-1674. Thank you for your participation.

Sincerely,

Scott Wesley, Ph.D.
Research Scientist

Enc (2)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Follow-Up Postcard

KNOWLEDGE BASE FOR BEGINNING SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHERS

Dear Colleague:

I recently sent you an inventory to obtain your opinions of what a newly-licensed Special Education teacher should know and be able to do. If you have not already done so, please complete the inventory and return it in the postage-paid envelope to:

Educational Testing Service
Mail Stop 11-P
Princeton, NJ 08541

If you have already returned the inventory, please accept my thanks for your help in this important project.

Sincerely,

Scott Wesley, Ph.D.
Research Scientist
Educational Testing Service

Appendix D

Demographic Distributions

	Number	Percent
AGE (years)		
Under 25	8	1.5
25-34	86	15.8
35-44	228	41.9
45-54	153	28.1
55-64	53	9.7
65 and over	12	2.2
No response	4	0.7
GENDER		
Female	412	75.7
Male	127	23.3
No response	5	0.9
RACE/ETHNICITY		
American Indian or Alaskan Native	3	0.6
Black or African American	17	3.1
Mexican American or Chicano	2	0.4
Oriental or Asian American	7	1.3
Puerto Rican	2	0.4
Other Hispanic or Latin American	1	0.2
White	493	90.6
Other	10	1.8
No response	9	1.7
GEOGRAPHIC REGION		
Northeast	115	21.1
Central	143	26.3
South	136	25.0
Far West	143	26.3
No response	7	1.3

	Number	Percent
HIGHEST EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT		
Less than Bachelor's	0	0.0
Bachelor's	5	0.9
Bachelor's + Credits	94	17.3
Master's	63	11.6
Master's + Credits	240	44.1
Doctorate	136	25.0
No response	6	1.1
CURRENT EMPLOYMENT STATUS		
Temporary Substitute (assigned on a daily basis)	3	0.6
Permanent Substitute (assigned on a longer term basis)	1	0.2
Teacher	294	54.0
Principal or Assistant Principal	11	2.0
School Administrator	21	3.9
Curricular Supervisor	3	0.6
State Administrator	6	1.1
College Faculty	110	20.2
Other	65	11.9
No response	30	5.5
WORK EXPERIENCE IN SPECIAL EDUCATION (years)		
Less than 1	6	1.1
1-2	11	2.0
3-5	65	11.9
6-10	97	17.8
11-15	117	21.5
16-20	101	18.6
21 or more	138	25.4
Never worked in the field of special education	1	0.2
No response	8	1.5

	Number	Percent
TEACHING EXPERIENCE IN SPECIAL EDUCATION (years)		
Less than 1	15	2.8
1-2	26	4.8
3-5	80	14.7
6-10	125	23.0
11-15	114	21.0
16-20	89	16.4
21 or more	84	15.4
Never taught in the field of special education	5	0.9
No response	6	1.1
GRADES CURRENTLY TEACHING[1]		
Preschool/Kindergarten	96	17.6
Grades 1-4	156	28.7
Grades 5-8	180	33.1
Grades 9-12	105	19.3
College	142	26.1
Do not teach -- Administrator or Other	67	12.3
Do not teach -- Retired	6	1.1
Other	57	10.5
CURRENT TEACHING ASSIGNMENT[1]		
Students with mild/moderate mental retardation	203	37.3
Students with severe/profound mental retardation	60	11.0
Students with learning disabilities	276	50.7
Students with sensory impairments	90	16.5
Students with physical impairments	88	16.2
Students with behavioral disorders/emotional disturbances	241	44.3
College students	143	26.3
Do not teach	54	9.9
Other	58	10.7

1 Multiple responses were allowed. Total will exceed 547.

	Number	Percent
TEACHING SETTING		
Public school for students with disabilities	133	24 -
Private school for students with disabilities	9	· -
Nonspecialized school (public or private)	177	3. .5
Residential treatment facility or institution	9	1.7
Correctional facility	2	0.4
College	118	21.7
Do not teach	44	8.1
Other	28	5.1
No response	24	4.4
PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS[1]		
American Federation of Teachers	39	7.2
American Psychological Association	25	4.6
Association of Supervisors and Curriculum Development	80	14.7
Council for Exceptional Children	527	96.9
Council of Administrators of Special Education	29	5.3
National Association of State Directors of Special Education	5	0.9
National Education Association	218	40.1
Other	189	34.7

1 Multiple responses were allowed. Total will exceed 547.

Appendix E

Importance Ratings for Special Education Professionals

	Teachers (N=295)		Administrators (N=41)		College Faculty (N=110)	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
A. THEORIES AND PRINCIPLES OF HUMAN DEVELOPMENT AND LEARNING						
1. Research and theories related to human development	2.58	0.90	2.95	0.81	3.10	0.85
2. Theories of learning	2.93	0.82	3.25	0.74	3.31	0.81
3. Social and emotional development	3.33	0.72	3.40	0.67	3.37	0.67
4. Language development	3.28	0.75	3.35	0.70	3.39	0.65
5. Cognitive development	3.36	0.68	3.40	0.67	3.39	0.71
6. Physical development (including motor and sensory)	3.03	0.81	3.13	0.72	3.05	0.82
7. Overall importance of Theories and Principles of Human Development/Learning	3.10	0.73	3.18	0.79	3.36	0.67
B. CONCEPTUAL APPROACHES TO DISABILITIES						
9. Medical	2.69	0.86	2.38	0.84	2.36	0.90
10. Physiological	2.71	0.84	2.35	0.92	2.43	0.81
11. Perceptual-motor	2.98	0.77	2.73	0.85	2.28	1.04
12. Psychodynamic	2.75	0.81	2.66	0.75	2.30	1.13
13. Behavioral	3.40	0.73	3.35	0.77	3.49	0.60
14. Sociological	3.02	0.80	2.95	0.93	2.99	0.84
15. Cognitive	3.33	0.70	3.30	0.76	3.41	0.63
16. Ecological	2.58	0.87	2.68	0.83	3.29	0.83
17. Eclectic	2.76	0.93	2.60	0.96	2.89	1.07
18. Overall importance of Conceptual Approaches to Disabilities	2.98	0.74	2.81	0.66	3.18	0.76
C. CHARACTERISTICS OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES						
General Characteristics of Students with Disabilities						
20. Physical and health	3.08	0.79	3.08	0.76	2.99	0.84
21. Motor	3.04	0.78	2.95	0.75	2.89	0.86
22. Speech and language	3.46	0.67	3.49	0.56	3.43	0.76
23. Motivational	3.50	0.65	3.60	0.50	3.50	0.71

Note: Mean ratings that are less than 2.50 are shaded.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

	Teachers (N = 295)		Administrators (N = 41)		College Faculty (N = 110)	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
24. Cognitive	3.48	0.60	3.50	0.55	3.61	0.67
25. Learning	3.59	0.57	3.63	0.54	3.76	0.53
26. Academic	3.34	0.69	3.46	0.55	3.56	0.63
27. Social	3.52	0.62	3.58	0.55	3.56	0.62
28. Emotional	3.64	0.53	3.65	0.48	3.53	0.63
Characteristics of Students with Emotional Disturbances or Behavior Disorders						
29. Adaptive behavior	3.42	0.69	3.46	0.71	3.42	0.76
30. Affective behavior	3.39	0.66	3.44	0.63	3.48	0.67
31. Social/emotional development (e.g., intrapersonal: self-esteem, self-concept)	3.66	0.56	3.63	0.54	3.66	0.57
32. Social/interpersonal skills (e.g., with teachers, parents, peers)	3.66	0.58	3.61	0.63	3.71	0.51
33. Relationship between E.D./B.D and distractibility, hyperactivity, impulsivity	3.58	0.66	3.41	0.59	3.26	0.82
34. Social maladjustment (e.g., delinquency, conduct disorders)	3.39	0.77	3.20	0.68	3.39	0.69
35. Aggression and/or acting out	3.59	0.61	3.50	0.60	3.49	0.63
36. Passivity and/or withdrawal	3.42	0.67	3.37	0.73	3.42	0.67
37. Anxiety and/or depression	3.42	0.68	3.29	0.72	3.31	0.72
38. Self-injurious behavior	3.30	0.76	3.22	0.76	3.24	0.77
39. Neuroses (e.g., phobias, psychosomatic disorders)	2.85	0.86	2.78	0.91	2.60	0.84
40. Psychoses	2.80	0.87	2.66	0.85	2.59	0.90
41. Eating disorders	2.68	0.89	2.63	0.89	2.69	0.91
42. Substance abuse	3.21	0.83	3.10	0.86	3.27	0.74
Characteristics of Students with Learning Disabilities						
43. Rate of learning	3.36	0.75	3.29	0.75	3.29	0.79
44. Memory deficits	3.48	0.66	3.24	0.77	3.30	0.76
45. Deficits in automaticity	3.08	0.76	3.13	0.79	3.00	0.76
46. Social/emotional development (e.g., interpersonal, self-esteem, self-concept)	3.54	0.62	3.49	0.68	3.44	0.72

Note: Mean ratings that are less than 2.50 are shaded.

	Teachers (N = 295)		Administrators (N = 41)		College Faculty (N = 110)	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
47. Intra-individual differences	3.23	0.76	3.26	0.72	3.32	0.81
48. Discrepancy between potential and achievement	3.42	0.69	3.30	0.82	3.33	0.91
49. Attention deficits (i.e, distractibility, hyperactivity, and impulsivity)	3.57	0.61	3.40	0.63	3.31	0.73
50. Academic deficits (e.g., in listening skills, written expression, reading, math)	3.64	0.55	3.59	0.50	3.72	0.56
51. Deficits in study skills and organizational skills	3.45	0.67	3.56	0.63	3.65	0.57
52. Deficits in metacognitive strategies and learning strategies	3.36	0.68	3.38	0.90	3.52	0.73
Characteristics of Students with Mental Retardation						
53. Adaptive behavior	3.50	0.59	3.66	0.53	3.68	0.58
54. Rate of learning	3.24	0.77	3.37	0.66	3.45	0.67
55. Memory deficits	3.15	0.73	3.15	0.79	3.18	0.78
56. Generalization deficits	3.38	0.69	3.41	0.67	3.56	0.60
57. Skill maintenance deficits	3.44	0.65	3.35	0.70	3.46	0.65
58. Incidental learning deficits	3.07	0.76	2.95	0.77	3.16	0.76
59. Deficits in abstract thinking	3.02	0.80	2.80	0.72	3.08	0.82
60. Resistance to change	3.18	0.79	2.90	0.93	2.98	0.83
61. Affective behavior	3.29	0.72	3.21	0.73	3.21	0.77
62. Physical and motor development	3.11	0.78	2.98	0.79	2.94	0.84
63. Language development	3.47	0.62	3.54	0.60	3.54	0.65
64. Augmentative communication needs	3.26	0.80	3.20	0.75	3.37	0.66
65. Social/emotional development (e.g., interpersonal, self-esteem, self-concept)	3.55	0.60	3.46	0.55	3.48	0.63
66. Family and personal living skills (e.g., sexuality, self-care)	3.60	0.60	3.51	0.60	3.58	0.58
67. Dependency or outer-directedness	3.32	0.73	3.15	0.74	3.23	0.80
68. Overall importance of Characteristics of Students with Disabilities	3.52	0.58	3.44	0.63	3.50	0.63

Note: Mean ratings that are less than 2.50 are shaded.

	Teachers (N = 295)		Administrators (N = 41)		College Faculty (N = 110)	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
D. LEGAL ISSUES, INCLUDING REGULATORY COMPLIANCE						
70. Social and legal considerations prior to PL 94-142	2.64	1.04	2.37	0.94	2.69	1.06
71. Major provisions of PL 94-142	3.45	0.76	3.18	0.90	3.66	0.62
72. Major provisions of PL 99-457	3.28	0.81	3.12	0.81	3.53	0.71
73. Major provisions of IDEA (PL 101-476)	3.39	0.80	3.32	0.85	3.74	0.52
74. Major provisions of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 Section 504 (PL 93-104)	3.13	0.83	3.10	0.91	3.28	0.72
75. Major provisions of the Americans with Disabilities Act (PL 101-336)	3.14	0.84	3.15	0.79	3.47	0.66
76. Educational implications of landmark court cases	2.68	0.95	2.76	0.99	2.88	0.88
77. Overall importance of Legal Issues, Including Regulatory Compliance	3.19	0.78	3.08	0.89	3.38	0.68
E. BASIC CONCEPTS IN SPECIAL EDUCATION						
79. Historical movements/trends in special education	2.40	0.85	2.41	0.81	2.83	0.83
80. Public attitudes toward individuals with disabilities	2.87	0.91	2.80	0.78	3.31	0.73
81. Causation and prevention of disability	2.89	0.92	2.66	0.79	3.14	0.86
82. Definitions and descriptions of all major categories of disability	3.26	0.81	3.22	0.79	3.30	0.76
83. Definitions and descriptions of specific disabilities, such as ADD/ADHD	3.13	0.82	2.83	0.74	2.74	0.86
84. Classification of students with disabilities (e.g., labeling, race and gender issues)	3.05	0.86	3.05	0.71	3.27	0.80
85. Prevalence and incidence of disabilities	2.34	0.85	2.15	0.74	2.38	0.88
86. Frequency/duration/intensity of behaviors	3.03	0.79	2.95	0.89	2.96	0.89
87. Degrees of severity	2.98	0.83	2.88	0.85	3.07	0.83
88. Overall importance of Basic Concepts in Special Education	3.08	0.67	2.95	0.55	3.12	0.71
F. PLACEMENT AND PROGRAM ISSUES						
90. Early intervention	3.37	0.79	3.46	0.67	3.53	0.63
91. Family participation and support systems	3.49	0.66	3.37	0.77	3.69	0.51
92. Continuum of alternative placement/services	3.35	0.67	3.38	0.70	3.57	0.66
93. Mainstreaming, integration, inclusion	3.71	0.52	3.59	0.77	3.81	0.52

Note: Mean ratings that are less than 2.50 are shaded.

	Teachers (N = 295)		Administrators (N = 41)		College Faculty (N = 110)	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
94. Least-restrictive environment	3.69	0.55	3.61	0.59	3.80	0.44
95. Noncategorical, categorical, and cross-categorical programs	3.17	0.75	3.10	0.84	3.30	0.75
96. Related services for students with disabilities	3.36	0.68	3.31	0.73	3.35	0.63
97. Regular Education Initiative (REI)	3.16	0.83	2.83	0.78	3.14	0.96
98. Cultural and community influences	2.96	0.84	2.90	0.74	3.28	0.71
99. Community-based training	3.03	0.85	3.25	0.78	3.40	0.68
100. Transition of students into and within special education placements	3.33	0.75	3.30	0.65	3.56	0.60
101. Post-school transition of students with disabilities	3.37	0.74	3.39	0.74	3.58	0.58
102. Access to assistive technology, services, and devices	3.19	0.80	3.38	0.63	3.45	0.74
103. Overall importance of Placement and Program Issues	3.44	0.63	3.37	0.67	3.64	0.50
G. **DELIVERY OF SERVICES**						
105. Teacher as a consultant/collaborator with other teachers and school staff	3.70	0.60	3.62	0.78	3.65	0.64
106. Teacher as a multidisciplinary team member	3.76	0.51	3.73	0.55	3.76	0.49
107. Teacher as a collaborator with parents	3.70	0.53	3.74	0.44	3.74	0.48
108. Teacher as a collaborator with community groups and outside agencies	2.99	0.81	3.11	0.92	3.09	0.82
109. Teacher's role in transition planning	3.35	0.72	3.49	0.68	3.47	0.62
110. Teacher's role in the selection of appropriate, least-restrictive environment	3.65	0.59	3.49	0.76	3.52	0.73
111. Types of specific programs (e.g., early intervention)	3.33	0.73	3.15	0.74	3.29	0.67
112. Teacher's role in providing health-related services (e.g., catheterization)	2.67	0.98	2.90	0.87	2.83	0.87
113. Teacher's role in working with related service providers	3.32	0.73	3.38	0.71	3.37	0.71
114. Overall importance of Delivery of Services	3.52	0.60	3.43	0.68	3.55	0.57
H. **ASSESSMENT PRINCIPLES AND PRACTICES**						
116. Basic measurement concepts (i.e., reliability, validity)	2.84	0.93	2.77	1.01	3.16	0.87
117. Interpretation of standardized test scores (e.g., percentiles, standard scores)	3.18	0.86	3.08	0.87	3.27	0.84
118. Nondiscriminatory evaluation issues and procedures	2.91	0.87	2.90	0.93	3.40	0.79

Note: Mean ratings that are less than 2.50 are shaded.

	Teachers (N = 295)		Administrators (N = 41)		College Faculty (N = 110)	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
119. Norm-referenced tests (group and individual)	2.88	0.84	2.78	0.92	3.09	0.81
120. Accommodations and modifications of evaluation procedures	3.10	0.83	3.10	0.90	3.39	0.76
121. Criterion-referenced and curriculum-based assessments	3.21	0.78	3.28	0.85	3.78	0.46
122. Informal assessments (e.g., teacher-made tests, teacher observations)	3.51	0.64	3.58	0.55	3.80	0.43
123. Portfolio assessment	3.14	0.81	3.31	0.89	3.25	0.85
124. Selection of appropriate evaluation techniques for various purposes	3.34	0.72	3.33	0.84	3.45	0.81
125. Use of data to monitor effectiveness of student's program	3.44	0.63	3.65	0.48	3.76	0.47
126. Interpretation of specialized evaluation results for IEP development	3.50	0.68	3.31	0.86	3.31	0.90
127. Interpretation/reporting of assessment findings to parents and educators	3.47	0.70	3.33	0.77	3.61	0.58
128. Preparation of written reports of assessment findings	3.23	0.84	3.24	0.83	3.22	0.92
129. Overall importance of Assessment Principles and Practices	3.40	0.65	3.39	0.64	3.60	0.53
I. **DELIVERY OF INSTRUCTION**						
Participation with Others in the IEP Process						
131. Determination of current levels of performance	3.66	0.56	3.65	0.58	3.67	0.60
132. Determination of instructional needs	3.77	0.46	3.77	0.43	3.85	0.43
133. Determination of necessary special education related services	3.53	0.67	3.40	0.71	3.45	0.66
134. Determination of necessary modifications to standard educational practices	3.71	0.54	3.56	0.72	3.66	0.64
135. Preparation of IEP instructional goals and objectives	3.72	0.53	3.80	0.46	3.74	0.48
136. Ensuring the legal correctness of the IEP	3.60	0.64	3.45	0.81	3.36	0.84
Instructional Development and Implementation						
137. Data collection and data-based decision-making strategies for the classroom	3.36	0.72	3.53	0.68	3.64	0.56
138. Chronological age appropriateness of instructional activities and materials	3.18	0.79	3.30	0.76	3.44	0.81
139. Developmental age appropriateness of instructional activities and materials	3.44	0.67	3.48	0.64	3.42	0.81
140. Appropriate sequencing of instruction	3.49	0.65	3.60	0.59	3.63	0.61
141. Methods for enhancing motivation (e.g., encouragement, reinforcement)	3.73	0.48	3.68	0.53	3.76	0.47

Note: Mean ratings that are less than 2.50 are shaded.

	Teachers (N = 295)		Administrators (N = 41)		College Faculty (N = 110)	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
142. Alternative methods for evaluation and grading	3.41	0.71	3.38	0.67	3.36	0.69
143. Identification, use, evaluation of curricular materials, resources, equipment	3.30	0.74	3.44	0.50	3.42	0.75
144. Modification and adaptation of curricular materials, resources, and equipment	3.56	0.61	3.58	0.50	3.72	0.55
145. Working with classroom personnel including volunteers and teacher aides	3.44	0.76	3.38	0.84	3.45	0.63
146. Use of cross-age and peer-group tutoring	3.07	0.81	2.92	0.84	3.14	0.69
147. Use of technology for instruction	3.20	0.76	3.26	0.75	3.36	0.68
148. Addressing cultural, linguistic, and gender differences in instruction	2.99	0.84	3.25	0.78	3.30	0.72
149. Influence of students' abilities and aptitudes on their achievement	3.34	0.67	3.28	0.85	3.24	0.86
Teaching Strategies and Methods						
150. Direct instruction	3.54	0.72	3.43	0.87	3.56	0.70
151. Cooperative learning	3.42	0.76	3.43	0.68	3.45	0.69
152. Task analysis techniques	3.38	0.74	3.43	0.71	3.49	0.74
153. Diagnostic-prescriptive method	3.26	0.79	3.40	0.81	3.01	0.97
154. Applied behavior analysis	3.28	0.76	3.28	0.82	3.35	0.75
155. Learning styles	3.50	0.64	3.33	0.66	2.99	1.12
Instructional Format and Components						
156. Individualized instruction	3.66	0.57	3.70	0.46	3.57	0.63
157. Small group instruction	3.67	0.56	3.60	0.63	3.62	0.61
158. Large group instruction	3.13	0.92	3.38	0.84	3.13	0.97
159. Modeling	3.59	0.61	3.65	0.62	3.62	0.59
160. Demonstration	3.48	0.68	3.53	0.78	3.56	0.63
161. Lecture	2.16	1.03	2.02	1.13	2.17	1.02
162. Drill and practice	2.88	0.88	2.59	0.97	2.80	0.98
163. Arrangement of timing and pacing	3.32	0.69	3.37	0.70	3.42	0.66
164. Questioning techniques (e.g., level of complexity, wait time)	3.42	0.69	3.66	0.57	3.55	0.59

Note: Mean ratings that are less than 2.50 are shaded.

	Teachers (N = 295)		Administrators (N = 41)		College Faculty (N = 110)	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
165. Corrective feedback	3.58	0.55	3.71	0.51	3.69	0.54
166. Reinforcement of correct responses	3.64	0.54	3.80	0.40	3.76	0.49
Areas of Instruction						
167. Teaching academics	3.30	0.76	3.41	0.67	3.63	0.59
168. Teaching study and organizational skills	3.59	0.60	3.71	0.51	3.74	0.44
169. Teaching learning strategies (e.g., SQ3R, memory strategies)	3.45	0.72	3.63	0.70	3.51	0.68
170. Teaching social skills	3.64	0.60	3.63	0.62	3.55	0.60
171. Teaching self-care and daily living skills	3.38	0.75	3.56	0.68	3.35	0.84
172. Teaching vocational skills	3.36	0.81	3.36	0.78	3.19	0.90
173. Overall importance of Delivery of Instruction	3.64	0.54	3.80	0.46	3.76	0.43
J. **CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT**						
Classroom Organization						
175. Physical environment (e.g., lighting, seating, barrier-free access)	3.07	0.80	3.15	0.76	3.22	0.81
176. Social environment (e.g., interaction patterns)	3.41	0.72	3.51	0.71	3.50	0.65
177. Grouping students	3.17	0.82	3.41	0.77	3.21	0.79
178. Structure of the classroom learning environment (e.g., expectations, rules)	3.63	0.59	3.68	0.57	3.63	0.54
179. Transitions between lessons and activities	3.33	0.74	3.54	0.67	3.55	0.62
Managing Student Behavior						
180. Behavior analysis	3.54	0.70	3.63	0.62	3.54	0.70
181. Data gathering procedures (e.g., anecdotal data, frequency methods)	3.12	0.83	3.18	0.87	3.37	0.79
182. Intrusiveness of behavioral interventions	3.24	0.75	3.29	0.87	3.27	0.80
183. Clinical and counseling approaches to change behavior	3.36	0.77	3.27	0.84	3.10	0.81
184. Behavioral approaches to change behavior	3.55	0.65	3.50	0.82	3.44	0.74
185. Self-management techniques	3.53	0.66	3.51	0.75	3.64	0.57

Note: Mean ratings that are less than 2.50 are shaded.

	Teachers (N = 295)		Administrators (N = 41)		College Faculty (N = 110)	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
186. Affective approaches	3.28	0.81	3.39	0.74	3.13	0.93
187. Overall importance of Classroom Management	3.60	0.58	3.59	0.55	3.62	0.56
K. **ADVOCACY ROLE AND PROFESSIONAL GROWTH**						
189. Teacher's role as advocate for students and families	3.31	0.76	2.90	0.97	3.29	0.73
190. Teacher's role as advocate for educational change	3.17	0.84	3.05	0.74	3.34	0.75
191. Teacher's role as promoter of advocacy	3.15	0.82	3.02	0.88	3.18	0.76
192. Responsibilities in cases of suspected abuse or neglect	3.59	0.63	3.63	0.63	3.68	0.59
193. Use of professional literature (e.g., research journals)	2.87	0.78	2.83	0.78	3.40	0.72
194. Implications of formal published research for classroom practice	2.69	0.76	2.53	0.88	3.14	0.80
195. Use of informal classroom research to improve instruction	2.89	0.80	2.69	0.83	3.37	0.72
196. Professional organizations and associations for teachers in special education	2.96	0.81	2.88	0.76	3.13	0.82
197. Influence that teacher attitudes/expectations have on student achievement	3.59	0.60	3.44	0.78	3.59	0.69
198. Reflection on one's own teaching	3.55	0.62	3.63	0.62	3.69	0.60
199. Overall importance of Advocacy Role and Professional Growth	3.15	0.66	3.13	0.61	3.41	0.60

Note: Mean ratings that are less than 2.50 are shaded.

Appendix F

Importance Ratings for Demographic Subgroups

	Gender		Race/Ethnicity		Geographic Region				Experience	
	F	M	POC	W	NE	C	S	FW	≤5	>5
A. THEORIES AND PRINCIPLES OF HUMAN DEVELOPMENT AND LEARNING										
1. Research and theories related to human development	2.74	2.82	3.20	2.73	2.95	2.63	2.81	2.71	2.53	2.60
2. Theories of learning	3.02	3.16	3.40	3.02	3.12	2.92	3.21	2.97	2.90	2.95
3. Social and emotional development	3.37	3.31	3.56	3.34	3.37	3.29	3.45	3.33	3.33	3.33
4. Language development	3.35	3.20	3.59	3.30	3.40	3.25	3.30	3.33	3.17	3.32
5. Cognitive development	3.40	3.24	3.56	3.35	3.46	3.30	3.39	3.33	3.27	3.39
6. Physical development (including motor and sensory)	3.11	2.86	3.30	3.03	3.16	2.99	2.99	3.07	2.97	3.06
7. Overall importance of Theories and Principles of Human Development and Learning	3.20	3.13	3.49	3.16	3.21	3.12	3.25	3.17	3.01	3.13
B. CONCEPTUAL APPROACHES TO DISABILITIES										
9. Medical	2.59	2.53	2.78	2.56	2.61	2.54	2.70	2.46	2.56	2.76
10. Physiological	2.62	2.61	2.83	2.60	2.66	2.52	2.70	2.58	2.67	2.73
11. Perceptual-motor	2.89	2.47	3.12	2.76	2.82	2.66	2.85	2.80	2.94	2.99
12. Psychodynamic	2.69	2.44	2.80	2.61	2.70	2.55	2.68	2.60	2.69	2.77
13. Behavioral	3.40	3.50	3.59	3.41	3.40	3.38	3.51	3.37	3.39	3.40
14. Sociological	2.96	3.09	3.27	2.98	2.96	2.91	3.07	3.04	3.07	2.99
15. Cognitive	3.34	3.37	3.54	3.33	3.39	3.28	3.41	3.31	3.34	3.32
16. Ecological	2.72	2.97	2.88	2.77	2.75	2.70	2.91	2.75	2.66	2.55
17. Eclectic	2.82	2.73	2.80	2.80	2.90	2.60	2.82	2.89	2.74	2.75
18. Overall importance of Conceptual Approaches to Disabilities	3.03	3.06	3.18	3.03	3.05	3.01	3.10	2.98	3.03	2.96
C. CHARACTERISTICS OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES										
General Characteristics of Students with Disabilities										
20. Physical and health	3.10	2.97	3.17	3.06	3.05	3.03	3.10	3.09	3.06	3.09
21. Motor	3.07	2.82	3.12	3.00	3.04	2.89	3.05	3.04	3.00	3.07

Note: F = Female (N = 412); M = Male (N = 127); POC = People of Color (N = 42); W = White (N = 493); NE = Northeast (N = 115); C = Central (N = 143); S = Southern (N = 136); FW = Far West (N = 143); ≤5 = 5 years teaching experience or less--teachers only (N = 88); >5 = More than 5 years teaching experience--teachers only (N = 204). Mean ratings that are less than 2.50 are shaded.

	Gender		Race/Ethnicity		Geographic Region				Experience	
	F	M	POC	W	NE	C	S	FW	≤5	>5
22. Speech and language	3.48	3.36	3.44	3.47	3.56	3.33	3.47	3.47	3.41	3.47
23. Motivational	3.49	3.48	3.60	3.47	3.42	3.42	3.55	3.54	3.48	3.51
24. Cognitive	3.50	3.55	3.59	3.50	3.57	3.46	3.54	3.46	3.49	3.49
25. Learning	3.60	3.72	3.66	3.63	3.69	3.57	3.66	3.59	3.50	3.63
26. Academic	3.34	3.50	3.39	3.38	3.35	3.40	3.41	3.35	3.18	3.40
27. Social	3.51	3.54	3.63	3.51	3.56	3.51	3.45	3.55	3.54	3.50
28. Emotional	3.60	3.61	3.73	3.59	3.67	3.57	3.57	3.61	3.68	3.62
Characteristics of Students with Emotional Disturbances or Behavior Disorders										
29. Adaptive behavior	3.42	3.40	3.44	3.42	3.41	3.40	3.42	3.40	3.33	3.45
30. Affective behavior	3.41	3.44	3.43	3.41	3.39	3.40	3.45	3.40	3.38	3.40
31. Social/emotional development (e.g., intrapersonal: self-esteem, self-concept)	3.66	3.62	3.68	3.64	3.67	3.65	3.69	3.58	3.63	3.67
32. Social/interpersonal skills (e.g., with teachers, parents, peers)	3.66	3.70	3.68	3.67	3.69	3.65	3.68	3.66	3.57	3.71
33. Relationship between E.D./B.D and distractibility, hyperactivity, impulsivity	3.57	3.26	3.63	3.49	3.58	3.43	3.55	3.44	3.53	3.61
34. Social maladjustment (e.g., delinquency, conduct disorders)	3.38	3.36	3.44	3.37	3.38	3.37	3.45	3.30	3.29	3.44
35. Aggression and/or acting out	3.58	3.51	3.63	3.55	3.52	3.50	3.62	3.59	3.62	3.59
36. Passivity and/or withdrawal	3.43	3.31	3.49	3.39	3.41	3.36	3.41	3.42	3.46	3.42
37. Anxiety and/or depression	3.39	3.26	3.41	3.35	3.37	3.26	3.40	3.42	3.44	3.42
38. Self-injurious behavior	3.29	3.19	3.37	3.26	3.29	3.14	3.30	3.34	3.33	3.30
39. Neuroses (e.g., phobias, psychosomatic disorders)	2.84	2.65	3.05	2.78	2.81	2.68	2.86	2.82	2.83	2.87
40. Psychoses	2.78	2.58	2.95	2.72	2.76	2.60	2.81	2.78	2.78	2.82
41. Eating disorders	2.71	2.52	2.88	2.65	2.68	2.60	2.70	2.70	2.71	2.68
42. Substance abuse	3.19	3.22	3.27	3.19	3.17	3.08	3.29	3.27	3.28	3.19
Characteristics of Students with Learning Disabilities										
43. Rate of learning	3.33	3.33	3.49	3.31	3.47	3.22	3.30	3.27	3.32	3.38

Note: F = Female (N = 412); M = Male (N = 127); POC = People of Color (N = 42); W = White (N = 493); NE = Northeast (N = 115); C = Central (N = 143); S = Southern (N = 136); FW = Far West (N = 143); ≤5 = 5 years teaching experience or less--teachers only (N = 88); >5 = More than 5 years teaching experience--teachers only (N = 41). Mean ratings that are less than 2.50 are shaded.

85

	Gender		Race/Ethnicity		Geographic Region				Experience	
	F	M	POC	W	NE	C	S	FW	≤5	>5
44. Memory deficits	3.43	3.34	3.49	3.39	3.49	3.35	3.48	3.34	3.40	3.51
45. Deficits in automaticity	3.06	3.03	3.17	3.04	3.20	2.98	3.10	2.98	2.95	3.14
46. Social/emotional development (e.g., interpersonal, self-esteem, self-concept)	3.53	3.47	3.73	3.49	3.54	3.45	3.62	3.47	3.44	3.59
47. Intra-individual differences	3.28	3.20	3.46	3.24	3.28	3.15	3.39	3.24	3.19	3.24
48. Discrepancy between potential and achievement	3.43	3.22	3.44	3.38	3.35	3.37	3.45	3.36	3.37	3.44
49. Attention deficits (i.e, distractibility, hyperactivity, and impulsivity)	3.53	3.35	3.59	3.48	3.58	3.44	3.54	3.41	3.48	3.61
50. Academic deficits (e.g., in listening skills, written expression, reading, math)	3.63	3.68	3.63	3.64	3.68	3.66	3.66	3.57	3.61	3.65
51. Deficits in study skills and organizational skills	3.50	3.55	3.49	3.51	3.49	3.48	3.56	3.50	3.44	3.47
52. Deficits in metacognitive strategies and learning strategies	3.42	3.32	3.44	3.40	3.37	3.33	3.43	3.46	3.40	3.36
Characteristics of Students with Mental Retardation										
53. Adaptive behavior	3.54	3.64	3.51	3.57	3.63	3.55	3.61	3.48	3.44	3.53
54. Rate of learning	3.26	3.38	3.29	3.29	3.39	3.27	3.34	3.19	3.26	3.24
55. Memory deficits	3.16	3.17	3.20	3.16	3.27	3.13	3.21	3.05	3.13	3.17
56. Generalization deficits	3.40	3.50	3.44	3.42	3.48	3.32	3.46	3.44	3.39	3.39
57. Skill maintenance deficits	3.42	3.41	3.63	3.40	3.45	3.36	3.44	3.43	3.44	3.45
58. Incidental learning deficits	3.09	2.99	3.02	3.08	3.13	3.08	3.13	2.96	3.06	3.08
59. Deficits in abstract thinking	3.02	2.91	3.15	2.98	3.07	3.00	3.06	2.87	3.03	3.02
60. Resistance to change	3.12	2.92	3.17	3.07	3.19	3.04	3.09	3.01	3.23	3.17
61. Affective behavior	3.26	3.20	3.41	3.24	3.31	3.28	3.21	3.24	3.27	3.29
62. Physical and motor development	3.10	2.91	3.27	3.04	3.20	2.95	3.03	3.09	3.09	3.11
63. Language development	3.50	3.42	3.49	3.48	3.58	3.42	3.50	3.45	3.43	3.48
64. Augmentative communication needs	3.32	3.19	3.27	3.29	3.39	3.22	3.28	3.30	3.25	3.26
65. Social/emotional development (e.g., interpersonal, self-esteem, self-concept)	3.54	3.43	3.63	3.51	3.48	3.52	3.54	3.53	3.50	3.57
66. Family and personal living skills (e.g., sexuality, self-care)	3.55	3.65	3.61	3.57	3.56	3.51	3.57	3.67	3.67	3.58

Note: F = Female (N = 412); M = Male (N = 127); POC = People of Color (N = 42); W = White (N = 493); NE = Northeast (N = 115); C = Central (N = 143); S = Southern (N = 136); FW = Far West (N = 143); ≤5 = 5 years teaching experience or less--teachers only (N = 88); >5 = More than 5 years teaching experience--teachers only (N = 204). Mean ratings that are less than 2.50 are shaded.

	Gender		Race/Ethnicity		Geographic Region				Experience	
	F	M	POC	W	NE	C	S	FW	≤5	>5
67. Dependency or outer-directedness	3.30	3.18	3.44	3.25	3.27	3.27	3.32	3.24	3.27	3.35
68. Overall importance of Characteristics of Students with Disabilities	3.54	3.41	3.49	3.51	3.56	3.48	3.58	3.46	3.56	3.51
D. LEGAL ISSUES, INCLUDING REGULATORY COMPLIANCE										
70. Social and legal considerations prior to PL 94-142	2.57	2.58	2.83	2.56	2.62	2.51	2.71	2.48	2.85	2.55
71. Major provisions of PL 94-142	3.46	3.43	3.59	3.45	3.45	3.33	3.56	3.49	3.56	3.40
72. Major provisions of PL 99-457	3.33	3.31	3.55	3.32	3.34	3.15	3.50	3.33	3.43	3.21
73. Major provisions of IDEA (PL 101-476)	3.47	3.46	3.63	3.47	3.45	3.41	3.51	3.53	3.52	3.33
74. Major provisions of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 Section 504 (PL 93-104)	3.18	3.03	3.41	3.13	3.21	2.99	3.24	3.16	3.20	3.10
75. Major provisions of the Americans with Disabilities Act (PL 101-336)	3.21	3.15	3.32	3.20	3.29	3.09	3.23	3.21	3.17	3.13
76. Educational implications of landmark court cases	2.70	2.85	2.93	2.72	2.75	2.59	2.85	2.74	2.63	2.70
77. Overall importance of Legal Issues, Including Regulatory Compliance	3.25	3.18	3.43	3.22	3.20	3.10	3.35	3.28	3.20	3.19
E. BASIC CONCEPTS IN SPECIAL EDUCATION										
79. Historical movements/trends in special education	2.47	2.62	2.80	2.48	2.51	2.37	2.67	2.46	2.54	2.35
80. Public attitudes toward individuals with disabilities	2.96	3.00	3.24	2.96	2.90	2.92	3.01	3.02	2.92	2.84
81. Causation and prevention of disability	2.90	3.07	3.20	2.92	2.96	2.85	3.03	2.91	2.87	2.90
82. Definitions and descriptions of all major categories of disability	3.29	3.20	3.49	3.25	3.24	3.20	3.41	3.26	3.34	3.24
83. Definitions and descriptions of specific disabilities, such as ADD/ADHD	3.05	2.81	3.24	2.98	2.98	2.91	3.10	3.02	3.10	3.15
84. Classification of students with disabilities (e.g., labeling, race and gender issues)	3.10	3.07	3.29	3.08	2.93	3.13	3.28	3.04	3.09	3.04
85. Prevalence and incidence of disabilities	2.31	2.32	2.83	2.27	2.21	2.27	2.42	2.34	2.36	2.32
86. Frequency/duration/intensity of behaviors	3.02	2.92	2.95	3.00	3.04	2.91	3.04	3.01	2.99	3.04
87. Degrees of severity	2.97	3.00	3.10	2.96	2.96	2.87	3.11	2.97	2.90	3.01
88. Overall importance of Basic Concepts in Special Education	3.09	3.03	3.20	3.06	3.02	3.01	3.23	3.06	3.06	3.09

Note: F = Female (N = 412); M = Male (N = 127); POC = People of Color (N = 42); W = White (N = 493); NE = Northeast (N = 115); C = Central (N = 143); S = Southern (N = 136); FW = Far West (N = 143); ≤5 = 5 years teaching experience or less--teachers only (N = 88); >5 = More than 5 years teaching experience--teachers only (N = 204). Mean ratings that are less than 2.50 are shaded.

	Gender		Race/Ethnicity		Geographic Region				Experience	
	F	M	POC	W	NE	C	S	FW	≤5	>5
F. PLACEMENT AND PROGRAM ISSUES										
90. Early intervention	3.42	3.41	3.41	3.41	3.55	3.33	3.38	3.43	3.32	3.39
91. Family participation and support systems	3.50	3.56	3.46	3.52	3.61	3.49	3.48	3.49	3.48	3.51
92. Continuum of alternative placement/services	3.40	3.40	3.35	3.40	3.36	3.37	3.41	3.46	3.34	3.36
93. Mainstreaming, integration, inclusion	3.75	3.59	3.66	3.72	3.79	3.65	3.68	3.73	3.68	3.72
94. Least-restrictive environment	3.72	3.62	3.61	3.70	3.67	3.65	3.69	3.77	3.69	3.69
95. Noncategorical, categorical, and cross-categorical programs	3.19	3.15	3.27	3.17	3.20	3.23	3.15	3.18	3.23	3.15
96. Related services for students with disabilities	3.36	3.26	3.41	3.33	3.38	3.28	3.32	3.34	3.41	3.34
97. Regular Education Initiative (REI)	3.16	2.86	3.30	3.08	3.24	3.11	3.02	3.03	3.16	3.15
98. Cultural and community influences	3.03	2.97	3.27	2.99	3.07	3.01	2.92	3.05	3.03	2.92
99. Community-based training	3.11	3.19	3.15	3.13	3.15	3.08	3.14	3.13	3.20	2.96
100. Transition of students into and within special education placements	3.36	3.41	3.49	3.37	3.38	3.32	3.38	3.40	3.34	3.33
101. Post-school transition of students with disabilities	3.39	3.48	3.24	3.42	3.48	3.31	3.42	3.44	3.53	3.31
102. Access to assistive technology, services, and devices	3.31	3.18	3.20	3.28	3.29	3.17	3.28	3.35	3.37	3.12
103. Overall importance of Placement and Program Issues	3.50	3.39	3.51	3.47	3.50	3.39	3.51	3.50	3.54	3.40
G. DELIVERY OF SERVICES										
105. Teacher as a consultant/collaborator with other teachers and school staff	3.70	3.54	3.68	3.67	3.71	3.69	3.53	3.74	3.67	3.72
106. Teacher as a multidisciplinary team member	3.77	3.64	3.70	3.74	3.71	3.71	3.70	3.83	3.79	3.75
107. Teacher as a collaborator with parents	3.71	3.64	3.63	3.70	3.66	3.66	3.66	3.79	3.70	3.71
108. Teacher as a collaborator with community groups and outside agencies	3.04	2.89	2.95	3.01	3.03	2.95	2.95	3.09	3.16	2.92
109. Teacher's role in transition planning	3.38	3.35	3.23	3.38	3.35	3.38	3.31	3.43	3.46	3.30
110. Teacher's role in the selection of appropriate, least-restrictive environment	3.61	3.49	3.58	3.58	3.54	3.55	3.56	3.69	3.63	3.66
111. Types of specific programs (e.g., early intervention)	3.31	3.15	3.28	3.27	3.30	3.18	3.34	3.29	3.32	3.33
112. Teacher's role in providing health-related services (e.g., catheterization)	2.73	2.63	2.60	2.71	2.63	2.65	2.89	2.64	2.59	2.71

Note: F = Female (N = 412); M = Male (N = 127); POC = People of Color (N = 42); W = White (N = 493); NE = Northeast (N = 115); C = Central (N = 143); S = Southern (N = 136); FW = Far West (N = 143); ≤5 = 5 years teaching experience or less--teachers only (N = 88); >5 = More than 5 years teaching experience--teachers only (N = 204). Mean ratings that are less than 2.50 are shaded.

	Gender		Race/Ethnicity		Geographic Region				Experience	
	F	M	POC	W	NE	C	S	FW	≤5	>5
113. Teacher's role in working with related service providers	3.36	3.21	3.30	3.32	3.38	3.30	3.28	3.32	3.28	3.33
114. Overall importance of Delivery of Services	3.54	3.42	3.50	3.51	3.54	3.52	3.45	3.54	3.59	3.50
H. ASSESSMENT PRINCIPLES AND PRACTICES										
116. Basic measurement concepts (i.e., reliability, validity)	2.91	2.91	2.95	2.90	3.00	2.94	2.90	2.81	2.78	2.87
117. Interpretation of standardized test scores (e.g., percentiles, standard scores)	3.21	3.10	3.13	3.18	3.21	3.16	3.18	3.18	3.20	3.18
118. Nondiscriminatory evaluation issues and procedures	3.04	3.02	3.33	3.02	2.99	2.98	3.02	3.14	2.92	2.89
119. Norm-referenced tests (group and individual)	2.93	2.91	3.03	2.91	2.96	2.87	2.97	2.91	2.86	2.88
120. Accommodations and modifications of evaluation procedures	3.19	3.16	3.21	3.18	3.27	3.11	3.23	3.15	3.14	3.10
121. Criterion-referenced and curriculum-based assessments	3.35	3.46	3.50	3.36	3.35	3.33	3.37	3.44	3.26	3.19
122. Informal assessments (e.g., teacher-made tests, teacher observations)	3.58	3.59	3.70	3.57	3.64	3.44	3.68	3.56	3.46	3.52
123. Portfolio assessment	3.20	3.10	3.15	3.18	3.28	3.04	3.12	3.28	3.06	3.18
124. Selection of appropriate evaluation techniques for various purposes	3.38	3.34	3.40	3.37	3.38	3.30	3.34	3.44	3.37	3.34
125. Use of data to monitor effectiveness of student's program	3.50	3.63	3.49	3.53	3.54	3.51	3.53	3.55	3.41	3.46
126. Interpretation of specialized evaluation results for IEP development	3.47	3.28	3.45	3.42	3.44	3.34	3.54	3.39	3.46	3.52
127. Interpretation/reporting of assessment findings to parents and educators	3.51	3.39	3.33	3.49	3.48	3.46	3.51	3.45	3.40	3.52
128. Preparation of written reports of assessment findings	3.24	3.01	3.21	3.18	3.30	3.22	3.08	3.18	3.14	3.27
129. Overall importance of Assessment Principles and Practices	3.44	3.39	3.45	3.42	3.49	3.41	3.41	3.42	3.42	3.41
I. DELIVERY OF INSTRUCTION										
Participation with Others in the IEP Process										
131. Determination of current levels of performance	3.66	3.67	3.50	3.67	3.74	3.57	3.70	3.65	3.60	3.68
132. Determination of instructional needs	3.76	3.80	3.78	3.77	3.80	3.70	3.83	3.77	3.69	3.81
133. Determination of necessary special education related services	3.51	3.38	3.50	3.47	3.51	3.37	3.58	3.46	3.42	3.58
134. Determination of necessary modifications to standard educational practices	3.70	3.62	3.60	3.68	3.72	3.65	3.70	3.66	3.64	3.75

Note: F = Female (N = 412); M = Male (N = 127); POC = People of Color (N = 42); W = White (N = 493); NE = Northeast (N = 115); C = Central (N = 143); S = Southern (N = 136); FW = Far West (N = 143); ≤5 = 5 years teaching experience or less--teachers only (N = 88); >5 = More than 5 years teaching experience--teachers only (N = 204). Mean ratings that are less than 2.50 are shaded.

	Gender		Race/Ethnicity		Geographic Region				Experience	
	F	M	POC	W	NE	C	S	FW	≤5	>5
135. Preparation of IEP instructional goals and objectives	3.75	3.66	3.83	3.72	3.77	3.68	3.78	3.70	3.65	3.75
136. Ensuring the legal correctness of the IEP	3.56	3.32	3.65	3.49	3.37	3.42	3.60	3.61	3.63	3.58
Instructional Development and Implementation										
137. Data collection and data-based decision-making strategies for the classroom	3.42	3.44	3.36	3.42	3.45	3.39	3.46	3.39	3.33	3.37
138. Chronological age appropriateness of instructional activities and materials	3.25	3.18	3.33	3.22	3.37	3.14	3.28	3.18	3.19	3.19
139. Developmental age appropriateness of instructional activities and materials	3.45	3.34	3.45	3.42	3.53	3.32	3.52	3.35	3.28	3.51
140. Appropriate sequencing of instruction	3.54	3.56	3.53	3.55	3.59	3.51	3.64	3.44	3.43	3.53
141. Methods for enhancing motivation (e.g., encouragement, reinforcement)	3.72	3.74	3.78	3.72	3.70	3.68	3.78	3.74	3.72	3.74
142. Alternative methods for evaluation and grading	3.41	3.27	3.38	3.38	3.37	3.37	3.40	3.36	3.48	3.38
143. Identification, use, evaluation of curricular materials, resources, equipment	3.33	3.28	3.43	3.31	3.39	3.31	3.37	3.21	3.29	3.31
144. Modification and adaptation of curricular materials, resources, and equipment	3.60	3.62	3.63	3.59	3.61	3.59	3.64	3.55	3.47	3.60
145. Working with classroom personnel including volunteers and teacher aides	3.43	3.34	3.48	3.41	3.42	3.36	3.38	3.49	3.37	3.46
146. Use of cross-age and peer-group tutoring	3.06	3.03	3.00	3.06	3.07	3.02	3.06	3.06	3.13	3.03
147. Use of technology for instruction	3.27	3.26	3.33	3.26	3.28	3.13	3.34	3.30	3.24	3.18
148. Addressing cultural, linguistic, and gender differences in instruction	3.07	3.09	3.45	3.04	3.17	2.99	3.03	3.13	2.91	3.02
149. Influence of students' abilities and aptitudes on their achievement	3.35	3.17	3.33	3.30	3.38	3.22	3.34	3.31	3.28	3.37
Teaching Strategies and Methods										
150. Direct instruction	3.54	3.46	3.48	3.52	3.64	3.46	3.62	3.38	3.49	3.56
151. Cooperative learning	3.45	3.35	3.40	3.42	3.46	3.41	3.37	3.43	3.42	3.43
152. Task analysis techniques	3.42	3.37	3.45	3.40	3.51	3.40	3.39	3.33	3.42	3.37
153. Diagnostic-prescriptive method	3.27	3.03	3.35	3.21	3.39	3.15	3.19	3.19	3.18	3.31
154. Applied behavior analysis	3.29	3.34	3.40	3.30	3.40	3.22	3.29	3.31	3.27	3.29
155. Learning styles	3.48	3.06	3.63	3.36	3.48	3.30	3.40	3.37	3.40	3.54

Note: F = Female (N = 412); M = Male (N = 127); POC = People of Color (N = 42); W = White (N = 493); NE = Northeast (N = 115); C = Central (N = 143); S = Southern (N = 136); FW = Far West (N = 143); ≤5 = 5 years teaching experience or less--teachers only (N = 88); >5 = More than 5 years teaching experience--teachers only (N = 204). Mean ratings that are less than 2.50 are shaded.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

	Gender		Race/Ethnicity		Geographic Region				Experience	
	F	M	POC	W	NE	C	S	FW	≤5	>5
Instructional Format and Components										
156. Individualized instruction	3.64	3.58	3.63	3.62	3.65	3.61	3.64	3.60	3.67	3.67
157. Small group instruction	3.65	3.56	3.63	3.63	3.69	3.58	3.63	3.64	3.69	3.67
158. Large group instruction	3.20	3.03	3.23	3.15	3.31	3.09	3.07	3.20	3.03	3.18
159. Modeling	3.61	3.51	3.50	3.60	3.67	3.53	3.61	3.57	3.55	3.61
160. Demonstration	3.48	3.48	3.55	3.47	3.54	3.37	3.59	3.43	3.49	3.48
161. Lecture	2.16	2.06	2.50	2.11	2.35	2.03	2.02	2.20	2.15	2.17
162. Drill and practice	2.84	2.79	3.23	2.79	2.93	2.71	2.94	2.78	2.84	2.90
163. Arrangement of timing and pacing	3.35	3.38	3.49	3.34	3.48	3.29	3.34	3.33	3.30	3.33
164. Questioning techniques (e.g., level of complexity, wait time)	3.47	3.45	3.43	3.46	3.57	3.39	3.36	3.55	3.33	3.46
165. Corrective feedback	3.61	3.61	3.53	3.61	3.61	3.57	3.66	3.60	3.48	3.62
166. Reinforcement of correct responses	3.68	3.71	3.68	3.69	3.68	3.59	3.75	3.73	3.63	3.64
Areas of Instruction										
167. Teaching academics	3.32	3.37	3.28	3.34	3.48	3.31	3.32	3.27	3.10	3.38
168. Teaching study and organizational skills	3.62	3.61	3.59	3.62	3.68	3.56	3.56	3.68	3.55	3.61
169. Teaching learning strategies (e.g., SQ3R, memory strategies)	3.49	3.44	3.44	3.48	3.51	3.40	3.46	3.56	3.39	3.47
170. Teaching social skills	3.62	3.58	3.63	3.60	3.63	3.55	3.58	3.65	3.59	3.67
171. Teaching self-care and daily living skills	3.36	3.37	3.56	3.34	3.38	3.29	3.37	3.39	3.43	3.36
172. Teaching vocational skills	3.32	3.25	3.36	3.30	3.28	3.22	3.30	3.42	3.38	3.36
173. Overall importance of Delivery of Instruction	3.67	3.68	3.62	3.67	3.70	3.59	3.71	3.70	3.63	3.65
J. **CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT**										
Classroom Organization										
175. Physical environment (e.g., lighting, seating, barrier-free access)	3.14	3.04	3.25	3.10	3.32	2.94	3.17	3.06	3.11	3.05
176. Social environment (e.g., interaction patterns)	3.45	3.40	3.55	3.42	3.51	3.39	3.37	3.49	3.40	3.41

Note: F = Female (N = 412); M = Male (N = 127); POC = People of Color (N = 42); W = White (N = 493); NE = Northeast (N = 115); C = Central (N = 143); S = Southern (N = 136); FW = Far West (N = 143); ≤5 = 5 years teaching experience or less--teachers only (N = 88); >5 = More than 5 years teaching experience--teachers only (N = 204). Mean ratings that are less than 2.50 are shaded.

	Gender		Race/Ethnicity		Geographic Region				Experience	
	F	M	POC	W	NE	C	S	FW	≤5	>5
177. Grouping students	3.22	3.17	3.35	3.18	3.35	3.10	3.22	3.15	3.09	3.21
178. Structure of the classroom learning environment (e.g., expectations, rules)	3.65	3.56	3.70	3.62	3.75	3.52	3.66	3.60	3.56	3.66
179. Transitions between lessons and activities	3.39	3.37	3.53	3.37	3.54	3.16	3.48	3.39	3.31	3.34
Managing Student Behavior										
180. Behavior analysis	3.54	3.60	3.51	3.55	3.65	3.47	3.56	3.52	3.44	3.58
181. Data gathering procedures (e.g., anecdotal data, frequency methods)	3.19	3.24	3.13	3.20	3.36	3.18	3.18	3.12	3.08	3.14
182. Intrusiveness of behavioral interventions	3.27	3.22	3.32	3.24	3.34	3.12	3.26	3.28	3.25	3.23
183. Clinical and counseling approaches to change behavior	3.32	3.17	3.33	3.28	3.43	3.21	3.28	3.26	3.36	3.37
184. Behavioral approaches to change behavior	3.54	3.48	3.45	3.53	3.68	3.39	3.51	3.52	3.59	3.54
185. Self-management techniques	3.56	3.55	3.55	3.55	3.68	3.46	3.54	3.54	3.55	3.53
186. Affective approaches	3.28	3.07	3.30	3.22	3.27	3.16	3.21	3.29	3.24	3.29
187. Overall importance of Classroom Management	3.63	3.53	3.46	3.61	3.73	3.49	3.63	3.60	3.58	3.61
K. **ADVOCACY ROLE AND PROFESSIONAL GROWTH**										
189. Teacher's role as advocate for students and families	3.27	3.10	3.29	3.22	3.25	3.13	3.24	3.30	3.40	3.26
190. Teacher's role as advocate for educational change	3.16	3.18	3.27	3.16	3.18	3.10	3.18	3.20	3.10	3.21
191. Teacher's role as promoter of advocacy	3.15	3.04	3.24	3.11	3.19	3.04	3.04	3.24	3.16	3.14
192. Responsibilities in cases of suspected abuse or neglect	3.63	3.60	3.61	3.62	3.69	3.56	3.63	3.61	3.52	3.62
193. Use of professional literature (e.g., research journals)	3.01	3.02	3.05	3.01	3.03	2.99	3.13	2.92	2.84	2.89
194. Implications of formal published research for classroom practice	2.74	2.83	3.02	2.74	2.87	2.69	2.86	2.68	2.71	2.68
195. Use of informal classroom research to improve instruction	2.97	3.03	3.17	2.97	3.01	2.95	3.13	2.87	2.92	2.88
196. Professional organizations and associations for teachers in special education	3.03	2.82	3.05	2.98	2.96	2.95	3.16	2.84	2.81	3.02
197. Influence that teacher attitudes/expectations have on student achievement	3.61	3.49	3.63	3.57	3.60	3.49	3.67	3.57	3.53	3.61
198. Reflection on one's own teaching	3.61	3.52	3.61	3.59	3.65	3.58	3.61	3.53	3.45	3.59
199. Overall importance of Advocacy Role and Professional Growth	3.24	3.13	3.27	3.20	3.25	3.16	3.26	3.18	3.17	3.14

Note: F = Female (N = 412); M = Male (N = 127); POC = People of Color (N = 42); W = White (N = 493); NE = Northeast (N = 115); C = Central (N = 143); S = Southern (N = 136); FW = Far West (N = 143); ≤5 = 5 years teaching experience or less--teachers only (N = 88); >5 = More than 5 years teaching experience--teachers only (N = 204). Mean ratings that are less than 2.50 are shaded.

51062-10914 • Y44M2 • 251251